

2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Music Date: April 29, 2019
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Grimpo, Herl
General Education Assessment Plan: 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 analyze a piece of music using commonly used analytical techniques in music. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Form — below standard: 0 papers; approaching standard: 1 paper; meets standard: 8 papers. Musical content — below standard: 0 papers; approaching standard: 7 papers; meets standard: 2 papers. Description — below standard: 0 papers; approaching standard: 5 papers; meets standard: 4 papers. Of the 9 student papers, 2 met the standard in all three areas; 1 met the standard in two areas; and 6 met the standard in one area. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> We had hoped that 80 percent of the students would meet the standard in all three areas. In fact, only 2 of 9 (22 percent) did. This apparently poor result is tempered by the fact that only the first category on the scoring rubric ("Form"), in which 8 of 9 students met the standard, truly measured analytical ability; the other two categories measured the ability to communicate the analysis in writing. Nearly all the problems students had in those categories dealt with their writing and with the organization of their papers rather than with their analyses. We think, therefore, that nearly all the students were able to analyze the music correctly even if they could not adequately convey their findings. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> The instructor placed a strict 700-word limit on the papers, and in some cases students did not seem able to address all the questions posed by the instructor in the space allotted. This may have contributed to seven students not meeting the standard in the "musical content" category. In addition, although the scoring rubric appears objective, in practice the scoring was much more subjective, and therefore less reliable, than we had expected. For example, the one student who did not meet the "form" standard missed only one item (the start of the second thematic area in a sonata-form movement), but it was such an important place in the music that the scorer decided that such a mistake automatically meant that the student did not meet the standard. Eight of the nine students, though, misidentified the start of the retransition to the tonic at the end of the development; but the scorers did not penalize the students for that because it was a less important place in the music.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> April 25, 2019 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Discussed at a regular department meeting. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Schultz, von Kampen. Nicole Jacobs was not present, so she was informed of the results later.
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 are not concerned about students' analytical ability, but we are somewhat concerned about their ability to synthesize their findings and convey them in writing clearly and concisely. We are only somewhat concerned because this is the first assignment students encounter in any course where they have to do this sort of thing. They used to take Music History to 1750, our department's writing-intensive course, before the second-year course in which the analysis assignment is given. In that course they learn to organize their thoughts and write to prove a claim, but several years ago we made Music History a third-year course in order to even out the music course load over their four-year programs and to give music education students less time to forget their music history before taking the Praxis examination in music in their junior or senior year. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> We are not overly concerned about the results for the reasons described above. In

addition, we have assessed students' writing ability three times over the past several years, and the results have showed students' writing skills to be generally quite strong. Still, there is certainly room for improvement in students' writing, although we are undecided how much that should be pursued with this assignment. The instructor, though, did mention the possibility of collecting a draft of the assignment before it is submitted for a grade, and he is also willing to allow students an extra hundred words in their papers to give them a bit more room to organize their thoughts.

c. *Program*: Not applicable.

d. *Assessment*: If we assess analysis again next year, we will either (1) select a different assignment to assess; (2) rewrite the scoring rubric for this assignment to allow a more concentrated focus on the analytical part of the assignment; or (3) consider "approaching standard" to be good enough for this assignment. It might appear that we are lowering our standards with the third choice, but in fact "approaching standard" seems a reasonable goal for a first assignment of this type.

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 we will obtain a better picture of students' ability to analyze music.

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? [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Submitted by: Joseph Herl **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 5/6/19

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed: 5/6/19 Approved

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na