Arapahoe Community College

2013-2014 Music Assessment Plan Data

Discipline Outcome
The student will be assessed on whether they have prepared a musical piece for performance on the end of semester recital.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Survey or questionnaire

Measure 1 Description:
1. The assessment method consisted of a form, to be filled out by the instructor, in which a piece intended for performance, learned by the student over the course of the semester is listed. The student’s progress on the piece is ranked on a scale of one to four:
   1. No piece selected
   2. Piece not yet performance ready
   3. Near performance ready (piece still needs some polishing
   4. Performance ready

2. A musical piece at or near performance readiness level is a good indicator that the student made sufficient achievement over the course of the semester.
3. The outcome was measured at the end of each semester.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
105

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
A good benchmark would be to have at least 80% of students prepare a musical piece to the point that it is performance ready or near performance ready by the end of the semester.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

A musical piece at or near performance readiness level is a good indicator that the student made sufficient achievement over the course of the semester.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Readiness Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No piece selected</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Piece not yet performance ready</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Near Performance Ready</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance Ready</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 2 Results:
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The benchmark level was that at least 80% of the students have a musical piece at or near performance ready (levels 3 and 4). 87.6% of the students assessed achieved this level, surpassing the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

In the previous year 87.7% of the students met the benchmark level. This year 87.6% met the benchmark level. The percentage was virtually unchanged between the two years.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Multiple measures were not used.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

In order to maintain strong results, the following steps should be taken:

1. Students taking private instruction should be encouraged to enroll in music fundamentals and theory classes.
2. Students should be encouraged to enroll in the various performance ensembles offered by the music department. Participation in ensembles will help refine the skills they learn in private lessons.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome

Responsibility and Accountability: Growth in personal development and responsibility demonstrated by the student setting goals by means of participating in the end of semester recital or equivalent.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Survey or questionnaire

Measure 1 Description:

Outcome Description:
Growth in responsibility and accountability was demonstrated by the student setting goals by means of participating in the end of semester recital or equivalent.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
105

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
A good benchmark would be to have at least 80% of students participate in the end of semester recital.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
Participation in the end of semester recital is a good indicator that the student demonstrated the personal development and responsibility to complete the desired task (successfully perform in front of a live audience).

**Measure 2 Type:**

Please select

**Measure 2 Description:**

**Measure 2 Sample Size:**

**Measure 2 Benchmark**

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

**Outcomes Met/not met**

Surpassed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

The surveys asked the students to check whether they participated in the end of the semester recital or reasonable substitute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in the end of semester recital-105 responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 2 Results:**
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
The student performance was 3.8 percentage points above the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
In the previous year's instructor survey 85.7% of the students participated in the end of semester recital. While this year's percentage is lower (83.8%), it is statistically insignificant.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
Multiple measures were not used.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
The music department will continue to emphasize the proficiencies necessary for a student to perform a piece on a recital. Many of these proficiencies, however, are inter-related. The private instructor meets with the student either one half hour or one hour a week and cannot always give the attention to all musical issues that must be addressed. In addition, an Instructor cannot enforce any practice schedule that might be suggested to a student. It is only a student's own personal initiative that will ensure they put in the proper outside practice time necessary to ensure they are prepared for a performance.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action
Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome

Cultural Awareness: Knowledge of music as part of Western culture. Test students on knowledge of specific instruments, genres, musicians, and historical development.

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:

1. This method determines what a student knows before beginning the class and compares it to what the student knows at the end of the term.
2. The assessment is administered each semester. In the 2012-2013 academic year 107 students took the pre-test, and 93 students took the Post-test.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

107

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

A good benchmark would be for at least a 20% average increase in scores when comparing the pre and post-tests, but any post-test score over 80% would also be considered as meeting the benchmark as long as it is a 10% increase over the pre-test score.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

A 20%-plus score increase is a good indicator that students have significantly increased their knowledge over the course of the term.
**Measure 2 Type:**
- Direct

**Scores and pass rates**

**Measure 2 Description:**

1. This method is used to confirm the validity of the results of the first measure.
2. The assessment is administered each semester. In the 2012-2013 academic year 107 students took the pre-test, and 93 students took the Post-test.

**Measure 2 Sample Size:**
- 107

**Measure 2 Benchmark**

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**
   - This benchmark is that at least 80% of students score 80% or higher on the post-test.

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**
   - A 80% of students scoring 80% or more on the post-test confirms that students in the class have an adequate knowledge of the subject matter.

**Outcomes Met/not met**
- Surpassed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**
- **Pre-test average score:** 65.5%
- **Post-test average score:** 87.9%

**Measure 2 Results:**
- **Percentage of students scoring 80% or higher on the pre-test:** 39.3% (42 out of 107)
- **Percentage of students scoring 80% or higher on the post-test:** 84.9% (79 out of 93)
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The average increase in scores was 22.4%. This exceeded the benchmark by 2.4%. 84.9% of the students scored 80% or better on the post-test. This also exceeded the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The average pre-test and post-test scores for the previous year was 66.3% and 88.5%, an increase of 22.2%. The current year pre/post test scores increased by 22.4% (65.5%/87.9%).

In the previous year 84.3% of the students exceeded the 80% benchmark. This year 84.9% of the students exceeded the benchmark. While this is an improvement, it is not statistically significant.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

The multiple measures each exceeded the benchmark.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The goal for the coming year should be for instructors to strive to improve these figures even more.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action
Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome

Knowledge of Specific Musical Terminology

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:

1. Specific music vocabulary questions embedded within the Pre-Test / Post-Test administered at the beginning and end of each term to all MUS 120 (music appreciation) students (Examples: *pianissimo*, *allegro*, melody, etc.).
2. This method determines what a student’s knowledge of specific musical terms before the beginning the term and compares it to what the student knows at the end of the term.
3. The assessment is administered each semester. In the 2012-2013 academic year 107 students took the pre-test, and 93 students took the post-test.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

A good benchmark would be for at least a 20% average increase in scores when comparing the pre and post-tests, or a 10% improvement for post-test scores over 80%.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

A 20%-plus score increase is a good indicator that students have significantly increased their knowledge over the course of the term.
Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

Pre-test average score: 67.6%

Post-test average score: 92.3%

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The average increase in scores was 24.7%. This met the benchmark of a 20% improvement for post-test vs. Pre-test.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

Last year’s pre-test/post-test improvement was 16.9%. This year’s increase (24.7%) was an improvement.
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Multiple measures were not used.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

Continuing emphasis on specific musical terms needs to be made this coming year.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)