

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2009-2010 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** 4-25-11

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth and Wayne Swisher

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The Music Department offers 6 graduate programs; a Master of Music in Composition, Conducting, Music Education, Pedagogy, Performance, and a Ph.D. in Music Education. All of the programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The Music Department's Assessment Plan, dated 2004-2005, contains well defined and articulated student learning goals and objectives for each of the six fields of study, but no reference was made to the graduate programs in the Annual Report.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: No reference was made to the graduate programs in the Annual Report, but the Assessment Plan identifies both direct and indirect assessment methods. The indirect assessment consists of the student's evaluation of the teaching, apparently using an evaluation form designed by the Music Department. The direct assessment activities include student's products consisting of compositions, music theory projects, research papers, and the student's final project. The Department's Assessment Plan also includes a time-line indicating which of the degree programs will be assessed each year over a 9-year period (2004-05 to 2012-13).

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The Music Department reported they did not include any assessment data for their graduate programs in the 2010 Annual Report. For the 2010 Annual Report the program reported only on undergraduate assessment.

In the 2009 Annual Report, the Music Department included a very brief report on the assessment activities for the graduate programs. However, the abbreviated student learning goals included in the report only marginally matched the goals and objectives in the Assessment Plan. In addition, it was not possible to determine what goals had been assessed, as there were no data reported for any of the assessments done. The reported results consisted of the following statement: "The overall trend is toward improvement and good interpretation of music. A possible area to work on is the technique of our students, which is directly related to available practice time."

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES _____ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N _____

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES _____ NO _____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

Since no reference was made to the graduate programs in the Annual Report, there would be no closing the loop activities.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- _____ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- _____ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- _____ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- _____ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- _____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- _____ Results are reported.
- _____ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- _____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- _____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- _____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- _____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- _____ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- _____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- X No results are reported.
- _____ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

From the information included in the 2009 and 2010 Annual Reports, it does not appear that the Music Department has been actively involved in assessment of their graduate degree programs. They do have a very well defined Assessment Plan, but there is nothing in the Annual Report to indicate that the program has implemented the Assessment Plan as written, and no data have been reported over the past two years to indicate that assessment is taking place.

It is recommended that the Music Department review the Assessment Plan that was prepared in 2004-05 to determine if it is an accurate reflection of the assessment goals and objectives for the Graduate Programs in Music. It is also recommended that the Music Department implement the assessment activities identified in the Posted Assessment Plan's time-line, or from a modified, updated plan and time line, and report on those assessment activities and findings in the 2011 Annual Report.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual report
- _____ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- _____ Other (please describe)

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Mary K. Askim-Lovseth</u>	Wayne E. Swisher
	Department	Marketing	Graduate School
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-2944
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	wayne.swisher@gradschool.und.edu

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: N Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2009-10 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music DATE April 14, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Wayne Swisher

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

The Music Department offers four undergraduate programs—Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Music, Bachelor of Music (BM) in Music Education, Bachelor of Music in Performance, and Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy. The Music Department is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), and currently all programs are approved through that accrediting body.

The Annual Report only provided limited information regarding learning goals such as, “appropriate performance experience...,” “appropriate knowledge...,” and “appropriate ability...,” and “progress toward.” These do not address specific learning competencies and would not be measurable. The most recently posted Assessment Plans were for AY 2004-05. The Plans provided specific student learning goals for each Program with subsequent objectives for each goal. All were well articulated. There is a great disconnect between the Department’s Assessment Plans and the Annual Report and this needs to be resolved.

The Plan indicated a four-year cycle of assessing each of the Programs. The BM in Performance was noted to be assessed for AY 2009-10.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to departmental goals.

- X 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
 X 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
 X 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
 X 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
 X 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
 X 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

According to what was noted in the Annual Report, no student learning goals were aligned with UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals. If the Assessment Plans were referenced, six of the goals were aligned; this is across all four Programs and consistent with the past review.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Regarding the BM in Performance Program, only one assessment measure was used; that was jury ratings of senior performances for six randomly selected students.

Though the BM in Music Education Program was not slated for evaluation, it was noted that the Praxis I exam was used for assessment. This was not an identified assessment method on the Plan. The Praxis I exam relates to reading, math, and writing skills. Reading and math do not align with any of the individual goals and the writing measurement would not specifically align with the student learning goal of "Students will learn to write effectively about music." Seventeen (17) students were selected from those who took the exam between 2006 and 2010.

No indirect assessment methods were noted.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___X_
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES___	NO___X_	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES___	NO___X_	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES___	NO___X_	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

No data were reported for the BM in Performance Program. A subjective comment was made, "each student shows good improvement in areas in which they are weak," with no supporting documentation. Many objectives are related to context and quality of student performance within the Assessment Plan. It would be important to document and track such elements in order to identify the areas of strength and areas for improvement.

For the BM in Music Education Program, it was noted that "84.2% passed the state requirement in writing."

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. .

- ___X___ 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data...analyze graphical information")
____ 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
____ 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...")
____ 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
____ 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

See previous comments regarding the BM in Music Education Program.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___X_
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

No comments were provided for the designated program under review, BM in Performance, that related to closing the loop.

It was indicated for the BM in Music Education Program to convert MUSC 441 Methods and Materials for Middle and Secondary School Music to an Essential Studies capstone course; and MUSC 310 and 311, Music History Survey I and II, to Essential Studies Advanced Communication 'A' courses in order to improve the pass rate on the Praxis I exam.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☒ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☒ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☒ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☒ No results are reported.
- ☒ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Music Department is in the initial stages of assessing student learning within its undergraduate programs. The plans are in place but there appears to be problems in their implementation. It is recommended to revisit the plans and see if they are still manageable. If so determined, then it may be best to begin with focusing on one goal of each Program's Plan. Curricular changes will be supported by assessment of student competencies rather than there being a 'feeling' something is occurring.

The Department needs to be more diligent in assessing student learning and documenting the results of the review process so that valid and reliable information can be used to assess if students are achieving the identified student learning goals and what programmatic changes need to be made if students are deficient in any area. If assistance is needed in these areas, the Department is encouraged to contact Joan Hawthorne, Director of Assessment, or the University Assessment Committee members who authored this report.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) | |

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Wayne Swisher
	Department	Marketing	Communication Sciences & Disorders
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-2944
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	wayneswisher@mail.und.edu

Section 1: ☐? ☐ Section 2: ☐? ☐ Section 3: ☐? ☐ Section 4: ☐N ☐

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done