

**Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Music (new)	106	MUS 106 12/21/2020- Creative Jazz and Improvisation II
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Languages & the Arts	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?

Yes

Spr/Sum 2017

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

There was no distinct data distinguishing MUS 106 from MUS 105. This seems to be a need.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

There should be some unique criteria based on the prior course data for a student who has taken this course for a second or possibly third time. Tools to assess student growth would be beneficial.

**II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Demonstrate techniques and vocabulary of improvisation at an intermediate level.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Audio or video recording of individual or group performance
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2021

- 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: 75% of students will score 75% or better.
- Who will score and analyze the data: WCC Music Department 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)
2020		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
5	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.

All students enrolled 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 enrolled 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.

Students were evaluated based on a recorded presentation of their performance (audio recording) or a live demonstration. The their work was scored on two criteria: melody and rhythm, using a 4-point rubric as follows: 1) Doesn't conform to piece standards; 2) Has some connection to the piece standards but is missing core elements; 3) Meets the standards of the piece; or 4) Shows mastery of the required standards.

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>
Four of five students achieved the standards or mastery of the outcome. 80% of students in this assessment and tool evaluation met the outcome.

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

Students were genuinely enthusiastic, seemed engaged in creating the assignment, and seemed to have achieved a standard compatible to the Intermediate level designation for the course.
--

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.

Due to small sample size, we need to begin to assess all students based on pre-assessment and post-assessment comparative models. Students could complete an entrance assessment that measures the same melodic, playing with the changes, rhythm/time and conceptual aspects, and compared with a final assessment of a comparable piece. This might measure overall creative/improvisational improvement as the focus of this outcome.
--

Outcome 2: Communicate proficiency in creativity or improvisation in recorded or online performance setting at a moderate to advanced level.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Audio or video recording of individual or group performance
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2021
  - 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: 75% of students will score 75% or better.
  - Who will score and analyze the data: WCC Music Department 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)
2020		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
5	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.

All enrolled 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 enrolled 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.

Students were evaluated based on a recorded presentation of their performance (audio recording) or a live demonstration. The rubric was used to score their work on two criteria, melody and rhythm, using a 4-point scale: 1) Unable to perform to piece standards; 2) Slight flaws in conception and time; 3) Improv. is satisfactory to the piece; or 4) Shows mastery of improvisation and time.

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  
Five of five students achieved satisfactory or mastery level in the assessment of this outcome. 100% of students achieved this outcome. The standard of success was met.

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

Students were passionate and engaged in their work, and by virtue of this could be assessed as being successful both "as a class" and individually.

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.

The move to online or virtual instruction of performance requires much clearer guidance, tutorials, and in general, wording of outcomes. "Group communication" in a musical context (as would occur on stage) is not as definable as group participation, willingness to work in group projects or collaborating using technology. Similarly, students that are older, returning or taking this course for a 3rd or 4th time should be gauged to some extent against their prior work. This requires a more defined use of Blackboard and audio recording technology and tutorials.

### 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.

Given the sample size and migration of student populations due to the loss of our only prior accredited certificate (Audio Recording) to another division, it is a bit hard to evaluate. We defer to the points below, as this course will need to migrate to current student needs and mixed or virtual/online delivery.

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?

Students seem genuinely engaged. Part of this is due to the maturity and age of the returning student population for this course. What we do know from qualitative evaluations of the students and verbal feedback: Tutorials for student use of technology and a considerable amount of new "music minus one" Blackboard audio assignments need to be available to motivate and advance student growth. Also, when certificates and / or degrees allow for younger students to take this course and use financial aid, we recommend criteria and rubrics be redesigned to student investment, discipline, and vocabulary growth over prior MUS 105 engagement. Blackboard must be used to collect artifacts across semesters.

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

All info will be shared with faculty in In-service and post semester communications: Zoom meetings and emails.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
-----------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------------------

Other: multiple	Assessment outcomes and use of assignments that collect in Blackboard across semesters can offer us a means to assess a student's progress within their own limitations and efforts vs. based on university entrance or standardized criteria. We must "move" to meet the student population as it evolves.	Any valid assessment must in some manner be linked to the student's goals and needs as well as growth from prior work (MUS 105). Additionally, conversion to remote or online demands a more comprehensive system of tutorials and applications (or bending Blackboard) to the needs of performance. More work needs to be done in this area.	2022
-----------------	---	---	------

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

Please acknowledge Steve Somers as co-contributor. He is not currently in CurricUNET to be added as a co-contributor.

### III. Attached Files

[Rubric-Data-MUS 106-12-20](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Michael Naylor **Date:** 12/21/2020  
**Department Chair:** Jill Jepsen **Date:** 01/05/2021  
**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 01/08/2021  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 03/17/2021