

**MUSIC DEPARTMENT CLUSTER MEETING**  
**Thursday, March 13, 2014**  
**2:00 – 3:00 p.m.**  
**(follow-up addendum from Thursday, April 24, 2014**  
**2:00-2:30 p.m.)**  
**Lake Worth Campus**

---

**ITEM 1. General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Review for the Humanities Area**

Discussion: In reviewing the results from the Fall 2013 (20141) assessment, the music cluster noted several concerns with the validity of the data.

- Inaccurate or incomplete data
  - In MUL 1010, it appears that data was reported for students who did NOT answer ALL the questions. 18 student (3.5%) were reported as having NO correct answers (out of 20 questions). A number of other students were reported with only 2-4 correct answers. The music cluster finds it highly unlikely that a student who attempted all 20 questions would not get any correct, and suspects that instructors reported data on students who did not take all the questions. Data should have only be reported on students who took and answered all 20 questions.
  - In MUT 1001, there was not data due to “sample too small”. There were, in fact, two sections in Fall 2013 (20141) and each had a separate instructor. This was the same as for MUH 2018 (where data was recorded) so the suspicion is that the sample was “too small” because one section failed to report data.
- Faculty teaching Fall 2013 classes were unprepared for the assessment and the assessment instrument.
  - Full-time faculty did not learn of the plan to implement an assessment tool until Convocation Day at the beginning of the fall semester. By the time the tool was developed and the information distributed to all faculty who teach these courses (a vast majority of whom are adjuncts) the semester was well underway. This meant that lesson plans, etc. for the first 1/4 to 1/3 of the semester were done without knowledge of the assessment or, most importantly, the tool being used to measure it.
- The need for data that represents a “broader” perspective
  - The music faculty feel that a “one shot” sample from only one semester does not give enough data to form an accurate picture. We feel that we will be in a better position to evaluate the data and its implications in Spring 2015. By then, we will have data from 4 semesters (including summer 2014). This will compensate for and error reporting or lack of preparation in Fall 2013. This will also make it easier to recognize trends and patterns rather than just a “one shot” sample.

Discussion: In reviewing the assessment tool and the questions, the music cluster noted the following:

- The cluster felt that the questions covered a good range of material, related closely to the learning outcomes identified, and required a high level of critical thinking (Blooms Taxonomy).
- The cluster felt that the data reported does NOT give the kind of data needed to evaluate the effectiveness of individual questions OR to establish areas of course content that need to be improved in terms of teaching approaches.
  - In order to improve teaching and/or revise curriculum, the cluster and faculty need to know WHICH questions the students are having particularly difficulty with. Currently, each faculty member only has data on his/her own students, but he/she does not know how this compares to the college as a whole.
  - In order to evaluate the effectiveness of a question (it is clearly written, does it really evaluate the skill intended effectively), data is needed on each individual question. If a certain question has a notably lower success rate than the other questions, it might indicate a problem with the question itself (the assessment instrument).
- For the future, the cluster feels it is essential to compile success rates (number of correct and incorrect answers) for each question and distribute that information to faculty teaching these courses. This would identify specific questions where success rates are lower (or higher) than the average and indicate where improvement in teaching methodology or a revision of the question itself is needed. Also, teachers could compare the success rates (question by question) of their own students again that of the college as a whole and see where they are having difficulty or doing particularly well.

Supplementary discussion (from follow-up meeting of 4/25/14): The music cluster was surprised (and disappointed) to learn that assessment data is not being collected for Spring 2014. We were never made aware of that plan. Apparently, the assessment is only to be administered to classes in the fall semester. The cluster feels that does not represent a truly effect sample of data to be useful.

Data/data source: email from Helen Schub documenting including the General Education Assessment packet and result from the Fall 2014 semester. Email from Helen Schub explaining that the assessment would only be administered in the fall semesters.

Action: The music cluster will develop a methodology for collect response data on individual questions, not just the overall score, for future assessments. The music cluster will also consider at its fall meeting whether to make the use of the assessment required for every semester – not just the fall semester – in order to get more data.

## **ITEM 2. Textbook for MUL1010 (Music Appreciation)**

Discussion: This is the end of the third year of using the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of our current textbook – Experience Music by Charlton, McGraw-Hill publisher. Normally this is when we would do a textbook review to decide whether to continue with the same textbook or change to a new one.

- In February, Michael MacMullen sent out an email survey to all faculty (full time and adjunct) who are teaching this course. He asked whether faculty were happy with the current text and wanted to continue to use it, were happy with the text but wanted to “maybe” consider other options, or wanted definitely to review and consider other possible textbooks for this class. Of the responses, all but one indicated that the faculty are happy with the textbook and have no interest in

reviewing other possibilities. The one dissenter was a “maybe” who liked the current text but wanted to “maybe” look at other options.

- In March, Michael MacMullen and Allen Webber met with the publisher rep from McGraw-Hill, Daniel Cohen. Allen Webber had attended a conference on some of the new features that McGraw-Hill is developing and was very excited about the possibilities they offered. He had questions about them and how they would relate to our current textbook. During the discussion, we learned two things:
  - The new (4<sup>th</sup>) edition of Experience Music will not be available until Fall 2015 – one year later than we had anticipated.
  - These new features will be standard will the new edition of this textbook.

Data/data source: email survey of faculty teaching MUL 1010. Meeting with Daniel Cohen (McGraw-Hill publisher rep)

Action: The music cluster voted unanimously to continue with the current textbook for the 2014-2015 school year. The music cluster also unanimously approved the upcoming 4<sup>th</sup> edition of Experience Music for usage starting in Fall 2015. This adoption will be 3 years (or until a new edition comes out).

<b>Attendance</b>	Michael MacMullen	Allen Webber	David Gibble
-------------------	-------------------	--------------	--------------

Submitted by:

Michael MacMullen  
[name], Scribe, Cluster Chair

c. Minutes Distribution List