

CLUSTER MINUTES

March 24, 2016

1:30 – 3:30pm

Lake Worth Campus

ITEM 1. Class Piano textbook (MVK1111A – Class Piano 1)

Discussion: The textbook used for MVK1111A (Class Piano 1) has become prohibitively expensive for our students. We currently use 1 textbook for Class Piano 1, another for Class Piano 2 & 3, and a third for Class Piano 4. The two textbooks for Class piano 2-4 are responsibly priced (about \$60), but the textbook for Class Piano 1 has grown to cost more than twice that amount.

Preliminary information was gathered by contacting music departments in other FCS member colleges to determine what they use. Based on that information, it has been narrowed down to two possible choices, each of which costs about \$60.

- Keyboard Fundamentals, 6th edition, Lyke, Edwards, et al, Stipes Publishing
 - We already use other texts by Stipes Publishing for Class Piano 2-4
 - This is a more basic textbook (suitable for the VERY beginning student) that could be used in Class Piano 1. The existing textbooks for Class Piano 2-4 would remain as they are.
 - Some colleges use the Stipes textbooks.
- Alfred's Group Piano for Adults, 2nd edition, Lancaster/Renfrow, Alfred
 - This is the first of a two book series designed to cover Class Piano 1-4. (Book 1 covers Class Piano 1 & 2; Book 2 covers Class Piano 3 & 4)
 - This would necessitate changes texts for all 4 levels of the class (to be "phased in" over two years.
 - Several colleges use this textbook.

Data source: emails from music faculty at other FCS colleges.

Action: Copies of these textbooks have been ordered for perusal. Cluster Chair MacMullen will work with the adjunct piano faculty to review these textbooks. Their choice will then be presented to the full cluster for an email vote by late May (for textbook approval for the fall).

ITEM 2. Pre-freshman level Applied music classes

Discussion: PBSC music faculty have long been interested in the possibility of offering a pre-freshman level of applied lessons. Many of our incoming students, although they have some prior experience and beginning level skills, lack the level of skill to be accepted into a university music degree program as a freshman. They use part of their time at PBSC to take music

classes to “bridge the gap” and prepare them for true university level classes. Unfortunately, our only option has been to allow these students to enroll in the freshman level applied class. Since they are working “below university level”, it may be several semesters before they are ready to advance to the sophomore level class.

During the recent Music Symposium, we learned through discussions that such pre-freshman level applied lessons are being offered at some of the colleges in the FCS. MacMullen emailed the directors and received emails from at least 3 colleges that offer such as classes, including info on the course number, description, requirements, etc.

Data source: emails from music faculty at other FCS colleges.

Action: Based on this information, the cluster will work during the 2016-2017 school year to present a new course request to curriculum to create pre-freshman levels for applied courses with the hope of having these courses available for the 2017-2018 academic year.

ITEM 3. How can your cluster support textbook affordability? Please provide your top three recommendations. Also, list initiatives underway such as open source textbooks, out of copyright materials, textbook rentals, etc.

Discussion: The cluster identified three things that we are/can be doing. These include some recommendations for other clusters to consider.

1. Research with other FCS colleges to determine what textbooks they utilize for courses. They may have discovered textbook choices that we are not aware of. (This was a successful process in researching the MVK1111A textbook.) A statewide database of textbook offerings (by course number) would be an effective research tool for clusters.
2. Supplement inexpensive textbooks with instructor created materials. The challenges of some less expensive textbooks is that they do not offer enough content for the student. Instructor-created content can help “bridge the gap” and make a less expensive option more functional.

An example of this is MUT1001 (Fundamental of Music). We currently use an inexpensive workbook for this class. The main drawback is that this textbook does not provide sufficient “drill work” for the students to learn and master new concepts and skills effectively. Adjunct Professor Ruth Ann Galatas created a number of additional drills and exercises for her web component class (to be done as homework assignments) and she has graciously agreed to share these resources with other faculty who teach this course.

3. Supplying information to students about different options for textbook version (and how to purchase). Many current textbooks come in multiple formats (traditional bound, full or partly online, loose-leaf “binder ready”, etc.). Although it is not always practical (or possible) to stock all the options at the college bookstore, there are many options available to the student. It is also important to inform the student of the various cost impacts. For example, for a textbook which also requires an online component, buying a “used” book may not save money in the long run (compared to buying a new bundled or online version), as the student will need to ALSO purchase a new online component (and the total cost may actually be higher than a new book).

It was agreed that one version (or one supplier) does not fit all situations nor offer the student all the options available. For example, MUL1010 students who purchase the online component (Connect), which includes an ebook, can then order a loose-leaf text (if they really want a print copy) directly from the publisher for \$15 additional!

We have also noticed that students who are on Financial Aid (many) will NOT avail themselves of lower cost options if they are not available in the bookstore as they do not want to incur any “out of pocket” expenses (although they will eventually receive the money when their remaining financial aid money is disbursed). For this reason, we have worked with the publisher and college bookstore to make the online only version of the MUL1010 textbook (Connect), which include an ebook, available for purchase at the college bookstore and not just directly from the publisher. This is a much less expensive option than a traditional bound textbook and online bundle (and the student could order a loose-leaf text directly from the publisher for only \$15 if he/she really wanted something in print).

Data source: None.

Action: Recommend that the FCS consider developing a “database” of textbooks in use by all member colleges (sorted by course number) as a research tool for faculty and means to share information.

NOTE: The following item is from a second cluster meeting.

**April 8, 2016
12:30 – 2:30pm
Lake Worth Campus**

ITEM 1. *FOR CLUSTERS THAT HAVE GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES*

As a cluster, please discuss the data provided to your chair and answer the questions below. Your cluster discussion should be included in the minutes if you are able to answer the questions today. If sub-committees are formed for follow-up, please enter that information in the minutes and submit any decisions made after today to IRE by April 29, 2016 (send email to Karen Pain at paink@palmbeachstate.edu).

Questions to answer in cluster or follow-up work by April 29, 2016

1. How do your current cycle results indicate your assessment instrument is measuring your selected outcome **and** that you have selected a reasonable benchmark?
2. In reflecting on this process and results, what changes might be necessary to the outcomes, instruments, implementation, or benchmarks for any of your courses, in order to move forward in a meaningful way?

Discussion: Administering the assessment:

It was hard to tell what the range of administering was since the majority of sections are taught by adjuncts who are not part of this discussion. A few conclusions were made, however, regarding administering the assessment. It was felt that “standardizing” the process of administering the question would be best (to create greater consistency).

- All questions should be administered in a “test” (or quiz) environment (not homework or other “open book” environments).
- Style (non-listening questions):
 - Each question should be administered as part of the test or quiz that is closest in time to when the concept is covered.
 - The style questions will NOT all be administered as one assignment but instead shall be “included” as part of scheduled test/quizzes.

- Listening questions:
 - Since these involve making comparisons from different stylistic eras, these should all be administered at the end of the semester.
 - These may be administered as a separate test or included as part of another test.
 - Since these are musical selections the students have not studied before, the students **may** use notes (that they have prepared) to assist with these questions.

Comparing data:

Year to year comparison was reasonably consistent, allowing for the “out of range” results the first year. There is often a widely different “question by question” result between different sections, but that does not indicate any particular pattern. Even different sections with the same instructor sometimes have different results. Questions that seem to be challenging for students college wide will be reviewed for possible improvement of the question. The overall result of the data seems to be consistent with how students do overall, but we do NOT have the data for college pass or grade rates overall for these classes.

We did feel that compiling the “question by question” data was very helpful and will continue to do that. There were problems with gathering data for Fall 2015 from all adjuncts on non-Lake Worth campuses.

The music cluster did feel that the assessment tool was well designed to measure skills related to the learning outcome.

Fall 2015 results indicate that our benchmark may be low for some classes (MUL1010?). However, because Fall 2014 results include a lot of “out of range” scores, it is hard to determine this. It was felt that we should go through one more round of the assessment and then re-evaluate the benchmarks ~~that~~ for possible revision.

Data/data source: (where appropriate): Results of Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 college-wide assessment. Assessment tool (MC questions) for MUL1010, MUT1001, MUH 2018 “Question by Question” results for same classes, Fall 2014 & Fall 2015

Action:

1. Revise the following questions for MUL1010:
 - Musical Style question #2: change D to “**almost** All of the music...”
 - Listening question #7: change A to “piano sonata”
change B to “piano concerto”
 - Listening question #8: change C to “madrigal”
2. Review the following questions for MUH 2018 (Gibble) for possible change:
 - Style questions: #1 & #9
 - Listening questions” #1 & #9
3. Contact faculty who did not submit “question by question” results for Fall 2015 term to try and get this info.
4. Send “question by question” results to all faculty (by fall 2016) showing **ONLY** the **total** results (not individual classes) for Fall 2014 & 2015. Faculty can then identify where their particular students are having difficulty.
5. Remind and encourage faculty to submit “question by question” results to cluster chair.
6. Communicate to all faculty (including adjuncts) policy on administering the assessment.
7. Recommendations to Assessment Committee:
 - Do assessment for both Fall and Spring semester.
 - Do include assessment for **ALL** sections of a class (not just select ones).

8. Review benchmarks for possible adjustment after 2016-2017 assessment round (particularly in MUL 1010)
9. Suggestion to Assessment Committee:
 - Can “college wide” grade results be compiled for Gen Ed courses for the semester(s) when assessment is done? The most helpful results would show the percentage of students for each grade (A, B, C, D, E). This data should NOT include students with W, WX, or FX grade as these students likely may NOT have completed the assessment. Comparing these results would help demonstrate how the assessment results compare to the students’ grades. For example, if 75% of the students get a C or better in the class but the assessment results showed that only 50% of the students got 70% or better (a C) on the assessment, then there is a “disconnect” between these data.

ITEM 2. Follow up on developing a “scenario” based assessment for Music General Education courses.

Discussion: There was one serious problem identified with administering this assessment. As described, a class would be divided into several different groups, each of which would do the assessment for a different Humanities area – Literature, Art, Film, Theatre, and Music. It was mentioned in previous discussions with the Gen Ed Assessment Committee that Film and Music (and possibly Theatre) would require the students to view a video (or listen to an audio) example of the art form (film, music, theatre) and then do the assessment assignment about that excerpt. Art students would view examples of art works, but that would not include audio (just video).

The music faculty have determined that this approach will not work for music. Having the students listening to a long musical selection (or selections) and then answering questions or analyzing the selections is impractical. The students need to listen to a specific selection with a question in mind and answer the question while (or immediately after) listening to the selection when they can still recall the musical example. This approach is used in several classes, in the “imbedded” assessment for music General Education courses, and even in professionally made learning support tools for different publishers’ books.

However, this creates a problem with disturbing other students in the class who would be working on “scenario” assessments for other Humanities courses. A group of say 15+ questions (with listening examples of about a minute) would take about 20 minutes to administer. The music played would be distracting to other students in the class who were working on other subject area assessments, particularly those who were trying to recall something they had viewed previously (theatre, film, art). Perhaps the best solution would be to have a separate class section dedicated to taking only the music “scenario” general assessment. One positive aspect of this approach is that the assessment would NOT take up the entire class time.

The music faculty reviewed the “artistic values” and made plans to develop individual questions for each area, each of which would have a unique musical selection (about 1 minute) and a specific directed question (multiple choice or short answer). In writing these questions, attention would be paid to the “vocabulary used,” avoiding specific musical terminology that might not be understood by all and using instead language that would be easily understood (or including an explanation of any musical terms that were used). The questions were assigned as follows (3+ questions for each topic).

- Form (pattern/repetition/contrast) – MacMullen
- Timbre (voices) – MacMullen
- Timbre (instruments) – Gibble
- Dynamics (volume contrast) – Gibble
- Texture (monophonic, homophonic, polyphonic) – Webber
- Rhythm/tempo (use of time) - Webber

Data source: email from Michael Seminerio (11/5/15) detailing the artistic values.
Music cluster minutes from 1/4/16

Action: The music cluster will pass our recommendations on to the General Education Assessment Committee. The music faculty will present and discuss the questions that have been developed at the Cluster meeting that begins the fall term. The final group of questions will be selected at that time and then shared with the General Education Assessment Committee.

OTHER.

Attendance:

Michael J. MacMullen,
David Gibble,
Allen Webber

Submitted by:

Scribe

c. Minutes Distribution List