Course Assessment Report Washtenaw Community College

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Music (new) | 134 | MUS 134 09/04/2021- <br> Intermediate Guitar |
| College | Division | Department |
| Humanities, Social and <br> Behavioral Sciences |  <br> the Arts | Arts |
| Faculty Preparer | Michael Naylor |  |
| Date of Last Filed Assessment Report |  |  |

## I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No
2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).
3.
4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

```
5 .
```


## II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Perform a song that utilizes the movable chords in three different styles of music.

- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Tool: Departmental review of video documentation of performance
- Assessment Date: Fall 2011
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: all
- How the assessment will be scored:
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
- Who will score and analyze the data:

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

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years <br> below) | SP/SU (indicate years <br> below) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020 | 2021 |  |

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

| \# of students enrolled | \# of students assessed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 5 |

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.

We will also add one of one student for Winter 2021. This is a cross-listed class and rarely has more than 2-3 per semester. A total of five students were assessed.
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 outcome was scored on a 4-point rubric at 1 (25\%), 2 (50\%), 3 (75\%) and (100\%) of accomplishment. All students were assessed by virtual/video Zoom performance. Performance assessment rubrics were developed by dividing each criteria into four measurable components. The standard of success stated that 70\% of the students would score $75 \%$ or higher.
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

All five students performed all three diverse song chord progressions. All students scored a $4(100 \%)$ and achieved this learning outcome. The standard of success was met by $100 \%$ of students.
7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

That each student was able to meet this outcome shows excellent instruction. The three chord formats were pop-anthem, blues, and variation on I IV V I.
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.

We think the bar could be set a bit higher... that they have to also perform a variation of one of the learned progressions without prior preparation. Also, greater variation in keys should be prescribed so that students are forced to apply the knowledge to more diverse keys.

Outcome 2: Perform the melody to a song.

- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Tool: Departmental review of video documentation of performance
- Assessment Date: Fall 2011
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: all
- How the assessment will be scored:
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
- Who will score and analyze the data:

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

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years <br> below) | SP/SU (indicate years <br> below) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020 | 2021 |  |

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

| \# of students enrolled | \# of students assessed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 5 |

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.

We will also add one of one student for Winter 2021. This is a cross-listed class and rarely has more than 2-3 per semester. A total of five students were assessed.
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 outcome was scored on a 4-point rubric at 1 (25\%), 2 (50\%), 3 (75\%) and ( $100 \%$ ) of accomplishment. All students were assessed by virtual/video Zoom performance. Performance assessment rubrics were developed by dividing each criteria into four measurable components. The standard of success stated that 70\% of the students would score $75 \%$ or higher.
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
Four students scored 4.0 (100\%) and one student scored 3.5 (87.5\%). All students were able to satisfactorily perform the melody (lead line) to requirements. $100 \%$ of all students scored $75 \%$ or better. The standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.
7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

All students were able perform melodies (lead guitar lines). The given melodies were indicative of current popular music practices.
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.

We think each student should also self-select a melody of a genre linked to their future performance goals and perform that at well, to include a motivation for achievement in the assessment.

Outcome 3: Play the Major, Minor, Pentatonic and blues scales.

- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Tool: Departmental review of video documentation of performance
- Assessment Date: Fall 2011
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: all
- How the assessment will be scored:
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
- Who will score and analyze the data:

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

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years <br> below) | SP/SU (indicate years <br> below) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020 | 2021 |  |

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

| \# of students enrolled | \# of students assessed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 5 |

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.

We will also add one of one student for Winter 2021. This is a cross-listed class and rarely has more than 2-3 per semester. A total of five students were assessed.
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 outcome was scored on a 4-point rubric at 1 (25\%), 2 (50\%), 3 (75\%) and $(100 \%)$ of accomplishment. All students were assessed by virtual/video Zoom
performance. Performance assessment rubrics were developed by dividing each criteria into four measurable components. The standard of success stated that 70\% of the students would score $75 \%$ or higher.
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
Three students scored 3.5 (87.5\%) based on eight scales to perform (they were unable to perform 1 scale) the other two students were able to play all ( 4.0 or $100 \%$ ). The standard of success was achieved for this outcome. $100 \%$ of students scored $75 \%$ or better.
7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

## All students achieved this outcome, which is actually fairly stringent.

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.

Other than how many keys can be tested (should students be able to perform all keys), this requirements seems mostly fine as is. Random selection of keys vs. pre-declared varieties of keys might challenge students even more. Note: guitarists however, mostly use similar fingering patterns for diverse keys.

Outcome 4: Demonstrate an improvised guitar solo.

- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Tool: Departmental review of video documentation of performance
- Assessment Date: Fall 2011
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: all
- How the assessment will be scored:
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
- Who will score and analyze the data:

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

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years <br> below) | SP/SU (indicate years <br> below) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020 | 2021 |  |

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

| \# of students enrolled | \# of students assessed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 5 |

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.

We will also add one of one student for Winter 2021. This is a cross-listed class and rarely has more than 2-3 per semester. A total of five students were assessed.
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 outcome was scored on a 4-point rubric at 1 (25\%), 2 (50\%), 3 (75\%) and ( $100 \%$ ) of accomplishment. All students were assessed by virtual/video Zoom performance. Performance assessment rubrics were developed by dividing each criteria into four measurable components. The standard of success stated that 70\% of the students would score $75 \%$ or higher.
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

Four students (80\%) were able to meet the requirement of improvising over an instructor-selected chord progressions. $80 \%(4 / 5)$ of students were able to score $75 \%$ or better. The standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.
7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were asked to select from one of the chord progression options. They were able to improvise over a progression. The students did well overall.
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.

Students might be encouraged to improvise over all the required progression types and their scores of proficiency averaged. For example, scores of proficiency for four chord progressions could be added and divided by 4.

## III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

This course was not previously assessed.
2. 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?

This course is cross-listed with Guitar 133 (Beginning Guitar). The diversity of abilities (beginning to advanced) in a single course is always a challenge. As this is due to WCC enrollment number requirements, we feel students are learning as individually adaptable as is possible. When we structure the semester more specifically to the outcomes (not allowing for as much flexibility), we get a variation of success: some become more disciplined (and therefore learn more/are more successful) and some feel less personally engaged and able to bring in their unique interests. Greater variation in allowing for student input in selection of pieces / genre might help achieve this balance.
3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

As soon as I submit this, the assessment will be shared. We are saving this information and will send it by email to all current instructors, although we've already discussed these goals and challenges.
4.

Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the <br> change | Rationale | Implementation <br> Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Course <br> Assignments | Students will likely <br> have a set standard | Individualization in <br> all courses---based | 2022 |


|  | of basic chord progressions, melodies, scales, and improvisational frameworks but then be asked to self-select their own, as well as be challenged to attempt to play or improvise one (as happens in real life). | on student needs, experience, goals, and most certainly to motivate beyond standardized outcomes, is an essential shift occurring in education. These changes should help increase student motivation, accountability, and flexibility. Creating an assignment where students do not know what progression, scale or improvisation framework will be requested will be beneficial. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

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

WCC has an unenviable structure for applied music (lessons). Since there is no approved infrastructure for private or small group work--more advanced or individualized work must all be rolled into cross-listed sections. This seems to be working about as good as possible-- but if anyone has an ingenious way to individualize instruction further/better...we're open :)

## III. Attached Files

Rubric
Assess. Data.
Gtr. 134 AssessChange
MUS 134 only data
Faculty/Preparer: Michael Naylor Date: 09/04/2021
Department Chair: Elisabeth Thoburn Date: 09/16/2021
Dean:
Scott Britten
Date: 09/20/2021
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron Date: 11/12/2021

