2020 – 21 & 2021 - 22 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Music Date: April 1, 2021 Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, von Kampen See General Education Assessment Plan 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). 20–25 correct meets the standard; 15–19 correct approaches the standard; 0–14 correct is below the standard. Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): What percentage of nonmajors taking our Music Appreciation course have a basic understanding of music terminology and history? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Class size: 21 students — 7 students had 25 correct answers; 8 had 24 correct; 3 had 23 correct; 2 had 21 correct; 1 had 17 correct. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Twenty students out of 21 (95.2 percent) met the standard, and one (4.8 percent) approached the standard. Our goal was that 80 percent meet or approach the standard, and 100 percent did so, so our results are well above the goal. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) Ideally, the scores were high because all of the questions on the test were related to knowledge that was repeatedly reviewed, referenced, and highlighted throughout the entire semester. But there might have been another reason for such a high success rate: how the test was administered. Because a number of students could not be in class due to Covid concerns, the exam was put online, with a time limit of two hours for the entire exam, which included the 25 multiple-choice questions. This meant that the environment and resources available to each student could not be easily controlled. Therefore, students were allowed to use class notes, the textbook, and even the internet. Unless a student possessed a good understanding of the material going into the exam, it would have been difficult to find the appropriate information guickly enough and to understand it in a way that would have helped reach the correct answer; but it is at least possible that this led to scores that were higher than they would otherwise be. Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: April 1, 2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) By email, then discussed at a regular department meeting. Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, von Kampen Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION*- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact: a. Teaching: no changes b. Assignment/course: no changes c. Program: no changes d. Assessment: In a normal year, the assessment would be administered under controlled conditions, with students not allowed to use the textbook, etc. 2. IMPACT*- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in

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

The scores could be a bit lower in a more controlled environment.

the next academic year?

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: 7/6/2021

 Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:
 Approved 7/6/2021

 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na