

2020 – 19 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Music	Date: May 6, 2021
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Blersch, Grimpo, Herl	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: <i>a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology</i>	
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> What percentage of music majors are able to compose music 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> Fourteen compositions were scored, representing all the students in the class except for one who did not submit the assignment, with these results: (1) met all standards: 8 students; (2) met two standards, approaching one: 2 students; (3) met 1 standard, approaching 2: 1 student; (4) approaching all three standards: 1 student; (5) met one standard, approaching one, and below one: 1 student; (6) approaching one standard, below two: 1 student. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Our goal was that 80 percent of students meet or approach the standard in all three areas. This was accomplished, with 12 of 14 students (86 percent) doing so. If the student who did not submit the assignment is counted as not meeting any standard, then 12 of 15 students (80 percent) did so. We observed that the two students who fell below standard submitted no drafts until shortly before the assignment was due, whereas most students submitted drafts over the course of a month. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> None.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May 6, 2021 <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, 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> The fact that the two students whose compositions were below standard did not submit timely drafts suggests that the opportunity to submit drafts and receive comments is useful for this type of assignment. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> The success of most students with this project suggests that the process of drafting and redrafting is a good way to help them internalize the various techniques of musical composition and analysis that they learned during the year. c. <i>Program:</i> The teaching of composition at this level appears to be effective. and no changes are proposed. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Next year we would like to assess a different learning outcome. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We hope to achieve comparable results. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> n/a	
<i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i>	
<i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i> n/a	
Submitted by: Joseph Herl	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/6/2021
Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: Approved 7/6/2021 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na	