Documentation of Scholarly Teaching – D. A. R. E. S. method
Dr. Shelly Stovall, Assistant Professor
MUS 214 – Music Theory 2
Friday, April 17, 2011

Course Overview:
- This is the second course in the music theory sequence
- 14 students
- Learning Objective: Students will part-write a tonal progression applying appropriate, historical four-part writing techniques.

Course Instructional Strategies:
- Students will have ample opportunity to practice part-writing, and will receive timely and significant feedback from the instructor throughout the semester.
- Students will evaluate peer and other examples of part-writing throughout the semester.
- Students will collaborate on several part-writing assignments throughout the semester.
- Student will use rubric to self- and peer-evaluate part-writing. The same rubric will be used by the instructor to provide feedback to students on their part-writing assignments.

Direct Learning Outcome: Students completing MUS 214 will write a stylistically appropriate four-part, tonal harmonization of a given melody and provide a complete harmonic analysis of the same.

Assignment used to measure participant learning: Students were given a 4-bar melody with the following instructions. "Harmonize the given melody using standard progressions and following all part-writing rules. Provide a complete harmonic analysis, including cadence and non-harmonic tones" (assignment attached).

Rubric: See attached below.

Evaluation & Aggregation of Data – Results:

Component	No Evidence 0	Emerging 1	Competent 2	Mastery 3	Average	Percentage Competent/ Mastery
Harmonic Progression	-	2	7	5	2.21	**86%**
Vertical Chord Considerations	1	3	7	3	1.86	**71%**
Horizontal Movement	2	7	4	1	1.14	**36%**
Cadence	-	3	9	2	1.93	**79%**
Non-Harmonic Tones (NHTs)	-	6	7	1	1.64	**57%**
TOTAL	3	21	34	12	1.76	

Summary & Reflection: As indicated on the rubric, student performance was best in harmonic progression, cadence and vertical chord considerations (70% or above performed at the competent or mastery level). Non-harmonic tones were significantly weaker, and horizontal movement proved to be the weakest area for students. There is a clear indication that I need to focus on horizontal movement for the duration of the semester. While I had some sense that this was the weakest area, I did not realize how much of a weakness it

was. I included average scores in the results, but in reality they don't provide much helpful information. What is more informative, is the percentages of students performing at acceptable levels.

<u>Indirect Assessment</u>: To supplement the direct learning assessment, I asked students to reflect briefly on what they perceived to be their greatest area of difficulty in part-writing. I did this after students completed the assignment, but before they saw their scores on the assessment. I did not reference the rubric when I asked them to do this, and they had not had any contact with the rubric immediately prior to this question (more or less a CAT). What I found was that students were overly broad in their responses, indicating things such as…. "I have a hard time writing progressions," "I don't like to harmonize melodies," "I prefer when we have to write from a given bass line," etc. In the future I will try to do things that help them think broadly, but across various contexts – for example, how to focus on horizontal movement regardless of whether they are harmonizing a melody, writing a progression, or writing from a give bass line.

Literature citations:

Ford, M. J. (2010). Critique in Academic Disciplines and Active Learning of Academic Content. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(3), 265-280.

McLeod, S. G., Brown, G. C., McDaniels, P. W. & Sledge, L. (2009). Improving Writing with a PAL: Harnessing the Power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment Rubrics. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 488-502.

Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A Review of Rubric Use in Higher Education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448.

What's next:

Through the end of this semester, I focused on horizontal movement. As I focused on this particular aspect of part writing, I came to the realization that non-harmonic tones are actually (for the most part) very much a part of the 'horizontal motion' of music. Of course I knew this, but never before really connected the trouble students have with horizontal considerations of voice leading with the trouble students have with non-harmonic tones. Wow – it's hard to believe I missed that!

As I look toward future semesters, I plan again on focusing more attention on horizontal motion generally, but specifically by tying together chordal horizontal motion with non-harmonic tone motion. I also developed a couple of new assignments were students analyze the horizontal motion between chords, rather than the vertical aspect.

Component	No Evidence	Emerging	Competent	Mastery
Harmonic Progression	Progressions do not follow standard conventions.	Most progressions are technically acceptable; Standard deviations are used inappropriately;	All progressions are technically acceptable, but may detract from a strong tonal progression, or be less than complimentary to the melodic line. Standard deviations are not used effectively.	Progressions are not only acceptable, but compliment the melodic line and support a strong tonal progression. Standard deviations are used is such a way that they increase the effectiveness of the progression.
Vertical Chord Considerations (Doubling, Chord analysis, position, distance between voices/overlap)	Errors in vertical considerations are numerous and mar the overall effectiveness of the progression.	Errors in vertical structure are apparent, and may be repetitive; Attention to vertical components should be increased.	Deviation from standard vertical considerations are minor, but may be somewhat repetitive; inversions may be used in a technically appropriate manner, but may not enhance the fluency of the bass line or compliment the melodic line.	Vertical considerations are clearly attended to; deviations from standard doubling facilitates melodic motion and horizontal considerations; inversions are used appropriately to increase bass line fluency; chord & position identification are accurate.
Horizontal Movement (Motion of voices, crossing, parallel motion, use of inversions)	Errors in horizontal movement are numerous and mar the overall effectiveness of the progression.	Errors in horizontal movement are apparent, and may be repetitive; Attention to horizontal components should be increased.	Deviation from standard horizontal considerations are minor; they may be somewhat repetitive	Horizontal considerations are clearly attended to; deviations from standard motion facilitates contrary motion and vertical considerations; voicing is fluid and artistic.
Cadence	There is no identifiable cadence.	Cadence is incorrectly identified, or overly week.	Cadence is accurately analyzed and correctly voiced; it provides an appropriate punctuation to the phrase.	Cadence is well-voiced and accurately analyzed; it provides an effective punctuation to the phrase.
Non-Harmonic Tones (NHTs)	No NHT's are identified.	NHTs may be are incorrectly identified, or incorrectly written.	NHTs are correctly identified and written, and are technically appropriately.	NHTs are correctly identified and written; are used to enhance melodic writing; effectively create and resolve harmonic tension.

Documentation of Scholarly Teaching
Dr. Shelly Stovall, Director of Assessment
New Faculty Orientation - Friday, January 07, 2011: 10:30am – 12:00pm

Workshop Presentation: New Faculty Orientation, Teaching Academy, "What every faculty member needs to know about assessment" (renamed "Using Assessment to Document Scholarly Teaching")
Overview:
- Twelve (12) new faculty members attended a 90 minute workshop on student learning assessment and documenting scholarly teaching as a part of the new faculty orientation.
- Building the Vision Goal: Effectiveness and Efficiency
- Learning Objective: New faculty will use assessment of student learning to provide evidence of scholarly teaching.

Instructional Strategies:
- Workshop was in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, with hands on activities for the participants (see literature citations).
- Two rubrics were introduced to the class: one for them to apply in peer review of each other's work and to guide their achievement of the learning objective; the other to provide more in depth information about the components of assessment necessary for documenting scholarly work, and for them to apply to the actual workshop components.

Direct Learning Outcome: New faculty will identify and qualify essential components of the student learning assessment process.

Assignment used to measure participant learning: "Identify five essential components of the assessment of student learning process that can subsequently be used to provide evidence of scholarly teaching. Be sure to qualify specific criteria for each component that can impact the viability of that component. Be concise - do not exceed 3 sentences per component."
- A sheet of paper, numbered 1 – 5 was provided for each participant to answer the question. Students were given a pre- and a post-test. The pre-test was given to highlight any cognitive dissonance; to provide immediate information to me about current level of understanding of the subject matter; and to demonstrate the difference between individual student evaluations and use of aggregated data to inform teaching.

Rubric: See attached. The rubric was used to evaluate student performance on both the pre- and post-test (and was also used by participants in the session).

Evaluation & Aggregation of Data:
- Results: Nine (9) faculty submitted pre-tests and 7 submitted post-tests. All 7 who submitted a post-test also submitted a pre-test. Rubrics with aggregated scores are attached. Scores ranged from 0 (no knowledge) to 3 (decidedly clear, distinct & insightful).
    - PRE-TEST

Avg scores:		Percentage *Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:*	
Direct Learning Outcome	0.89	Direct Learning Outcome	22%
Appropriate Assignment	1.44	Appropriate Assignment	44%
Rubric	0.44	Rubric	11%
Evaluation	1.78	Evaluation	67%
Summarization/Reflection	0.22	Summarization/Reflection	0%

    - POST-TEST

Avg scores:		Percentage *Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:*	
Direct Learning Outcome	2.57	Direct Learning Outcome	100%
Appropriate Assignment	2.43	Appropriate Assignment	100%
Rubric	2.71	Rubric	100%
Evaluation	2.29	Evaluation	100%

There is clear improvement in all scores from pre- to post- testing. There is a total of 2 points improvement in 'rubric' and 'summarization/reflection,' and almost 2 points of improvement in 'direct learning outcome'. There was essentially 1 point of improvement in 'appropriate assignment'. The least amount of improvement was in 'evaluation,' which was the highest average score on the pre-test. Likewise, the percentage of participants scoring in the "clearly aware" and "decidedly clear" categories improved, to the degree that all those who submitted the post-test scored in one of these two categories.

Summary & Reflection: While it is certainly possible that participants who did not submit the assignment might have impacted the results, it does not diminish the significant improvement on the assignment. Some of improvement may be attributed to the participants' uncertainty about the expectations on the pre-test, while post-test expectations were clear. Also, the close proximity between the presentation of the material and the assessment likely had some positive impact on the results. While the results of the post-test were worthy, the question remains as to whether or not participants will retain the information into the ensuing weeks/months, and more importantly, whether or not they will actually use the techniques introduced in this workshop.

Indirect Assessment: An evaluation/survey of participant reaction to the workshop was also collected. Ten (10) participants completed the survey. It is not clear whether the 9 participants that submitted the pre- (and post-) test were all included in the 10 evaluation surveys (as there were 12 participants total), and there is some indication that they were not. While a gain in performance of the intended outcome appears to have been successful, comments from the evaluation/survey indicate participants were widely split on their perception of the value and presentation of the material. Some participants were highly enthusiastic, while others were vehement in their critique. This is both interesting and disturbing. While I am pleased performance on the outcome improved, I am concerned that the workshop may have alienated some participants. My overriding goal is to make assessment amenable and valuable to faculty. I am concerned that I may have done the opposite. As far as speculating as to the divergence of opinions, it may be that those with more assessment background/experience found the structure of the workshop meaningful, and perhaps even enlightening, whereas individuals with less knowledge/background found it confusing/frustrating. This will certainly weigh in my decision about when/if/where to use this type of workshop in the future. Because of the positive comments, both written and verbally communicated to me by some participants after the session, I am considering that part of the problem may have been that this was the wrong audience for this particular workshop.

Finally, one participant made suggestions in the session about peer review vs. self-review, and order of application of the second rubric. I will certainly take her suggestions to heart.

Literature citations:
Ford, M. J. (2010). Critique in Academic Disciplines and Active Learning of Academic Content. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(3), 265-280.

McLeod, S. G., Brown, G. C., McDaniels, P. W. & Sledge, L. (2009). Improving Writing with a PAL: Harnessing the Power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment Rubrics. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 488-502.

Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A Review of Rubric Use in Higher Education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448.

Rotgans, J. I., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). The Role of Teachers in Facilitating Situational Interest in an Active-Learning Classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 27(1), 37-42.