

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Music	154	MUS 154 09/27/2016- Functional Piano I
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Performing Arts	Michael Naylor
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify the notes on the keyboard in treble and bass clef and demonstrate proper hand position for performance execution.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student performance
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2012
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students must score a 75% or better on the performance.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
48	41

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Students withdrew or were absent during assessment period.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All sections were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The individual student performances for note placement and hand positions were reviewed using a departmentally-developed rubric. The rubric used a scale of 1 to 4.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Forty-one students scored a combined 150 points on "Reading Music Pitch Rubric" and "Performance Hand Position Coordination" = 3.6 average. Of the students assessed 92% scored 75% or higher as determined by Piano faculty. Considerably above the 75% recommended threshold and in fulfillment of the Outcome or tool.

Recommend: Change master syllabus language of outcomes to be more specific or detailed.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were universally successful on identifying pitches 92% of the time. There seemed to be little hesitation or concern in them achieving this outcome.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although the current mode of identification of pitches on piano for treble / bass clefs seem adequate, we are exploring the instruction of timed (metronomic) identification moving forward.

Outcome 2: Articulate the value of the different notes (rhythm).

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student performance
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2012
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students must score a 75% or better on the performance.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
48	41

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Students withdrew or were absent during assessment period.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All sections were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The individual student performances for note placement and hand positions were reviewed using a departmentally-developed rubric. The rubric used a scale of 1 to 4.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Forty-one students were evaluated on two rubrics evaluating both rhythmic note values and dynamics/techniques of performance related to these values. Students averaged 3.65 and 94% of students scored 75% or better considerably higher than 70% requirement.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were successful on this outcome over 90% of all questions (well above the threshold of success).

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

This goal was met with general time keeping (maintaining a beat by the instructor). We are considering using a metronome at a students selected tempo that meets their respective goals for music in the future.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Basic student accomplishment of current outcomes is fine. Instructional assessment was fine to existing outcomes. However, recommend a change in outcomes to accommodate pitch accuracy treble and bass clef and coordination/fingering of combined clef performance as separate outcomes.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

A copy of this report will be shared at the next full faculty meeting with PT (current) piano instructors and wording for the Master syllabus will be adjusted, including outcomes.

3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Suggest dividing outcome #1 into two separate outcomes including: recognition and accuracy of pitch in treble and bass clefs and #2 fingering and coordination of performance clefs separate and together.	Current single outcome gives potentially too much to assess in a single rubric.	2017

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

No - just a "modernization" and reformatting of the Master Syllabus should be revised in the next year :)

III. Attached Files

[Rubric MUS 154](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Michael Naylor **Date:** 11/01/2016

Department Chair: Noonie Anderson **Date:** 12/19/2016

Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 12/20/2016

Assessment Committee Chair: Ruth Walsh **Date:** 01/31/2017