

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Music	155	MUS 155 10/20/2016- Functional Piano II
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: Recognize all 24 major/minor keys.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student performance
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2012
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of one full section.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score 75% or higher 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)
	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
7	12

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.

Some students were absent or withdrew before or after the administration of the assessment.

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 students in 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.

Each individual was individually assessed in a private setting on each of the two outcomes. Scoring was blindly done based on the four-tier rubric criteria.

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

100% of the students taking this assessment met the required 75% threshold on each of the outcomes.

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

Students had no problem playing our dictating the 24 major/minor keys with correct fingerings.

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 performance of the scales is the core requirement - we may also implement the recitation verbally of keys and scales so students may learn to apply the information in other contexts "mentally".

Outcome 2: Acquire the physical skills to execute more complex exercises/passages with greater speed, flexibility and clear articulation.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student performance
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2012
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50% of the students with a minimum of one full section.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score 75% or higher 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)
	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
7	12

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.

Some students were absent or withdrew prior to assessment date.

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 students in all sections were included in the assessment.

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

This was a more subjective assessment of the outcome based on the four-tier rubric by PT instructors in an individual setting.

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: <u>Yes</u>
100% of all students met the 75% required level in this outcome.

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

Students were assessed based on patterns and exercises given in class. They naturally were able to perform these exercises over 90% of the time.
--

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 outcome may require some re-thinking so that there is greater detail invested in the outcome and potential assessment.

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?

Overall assessment of the students seems to indicate a general accomplishment in both outcomes. However, the rubric itself seems too generic to be specific or accurate. Recommend a revised rubric in future assessments.
--

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

All information will be shared with all PT faculty at Fall inservice.

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

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

Recommend only a change in rubric development and assessment procedures.
--

III. Attached Files

[Rubric MUS 155](#)

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