Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT Music

______**DATE**___February 25, 2014_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWBac	chelor of Arts in	Music	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING RE	XVIEW_Mary A	Askim-Lovse	eth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:			
The Bachelor of Arts in Music is one of four undergraduat programs are accredited by the National Association of Sci			sic Department. The Department's
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 200- goals and objectives for three of the four undergraduate po- specific competencies and were well articulated.			
According to the Assessment Plan, the course areas of "A no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Ansubsequent objectives for the program, Objective 3.1 was a All students, vocal and instrumental, will perform varied repertoire of literature for their instrumental."	nual Report indic assessed during t 1 music with expr	cated that of the The academic Tession and te	the three student learning goals and 18 year. chnical accuracy from a large and
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UNI (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify whice	ch goals are simil te and speak in vertice and speak in vertice intellectually refer intellectually general terms of the complete intellectual terms of the	ar to program arious setting curious"; an y creative"; e ical dataan etive, efficien understandin	n goals. gs with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ng") the world")
Comments regarding program goals and alignment with	institutional and	l Essential St	tudies goals:

The "?" noted above indicates there was a student learning goal that could align with lifelong learning but inferences were needed. Students could develop lifelong learning skills but that is not indicative of a commitment to lifelong learning.

Specific examples of goals and objectives that relate to institutional and Essential Studies goals include—

Objective 2.4: Students will learn to write effectively about music.

Objective 1.2: Students will <u>analyze</u> written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music. Goal 3: Students will <u>express themselves creatively</u> through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

Goal 2: Students will <u>develop life-long learning skills</u> in musical reading, listening, analysis, evaluation and synthesis that will enable them to learn new music independently, and recognize and pursue excellence in their musical experiences.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment		YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
Comments:				
sampled. Th	culty members were the assessment team; this is a e jury, which represented different specialization. ness to their area.			
how student	methods were reported, though the Assessment Pi teaching evaluations relate to the BA in Music de consider some student self-reporting surveys in t	egree as there		
3. ASSESS	MENT RESULTS			
Were any as	sessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
•	If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? If so, were the results clear in terms of how	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N
	learning?	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
is up for [sid acceptable t Music progr	data were reported, but rather the statements—"(c) years past, but an unacceptably large group of to the range of students passing juries is too wide rams also had performance objectives, these comment. It would beneficial to see the performance date.	substandard p (that too man nents cannot l	performers ar y low-achievi be attached to	e still music majors." "range from ng students are passing)." Since other
	o program goals, some assessment results may be r which the program presents findings, and, for in			

Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data...analyze graphical information")

1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")

5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use")

2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)

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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? Comments:	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_
	titems will be "investigated," all related to the process. These their area of expertise), the jury form (uniformity or not across so for assessment (it appears evaluation is currently more
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place	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 X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates X_ No results are reported X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Music Department still appears to be in the initial stages of assessing student learning. The focus has been on the process and should begin to target how to improve the students' learning. If there is still an "unacceptably large group of substandard performers," dialogue should begin on how to improve their performances. Changing the composition of the jury or the measurement instrument may not do so, as it was noted that assessment of this kind still has an element of subjectivity.

The Department should be more diligent in documenting the assessment results. Having valid and reliable data that is delineated by appropriate competencies will allow for targeting specific areas that need improvement. A general comment regarding students' performance abilities does not provide any insight into what attributes of performance need that improvement. As a result, it is difficult to initiate any pedagogical changes. The Department may want to consider some forms of formative assessment that would identify areas for improvement earlier in the students' program.

Because of the number of programs, the rotational method of assessment is a good management strategy. With the extensive number of student learning objectives within each program, the assessment process is more manageable. Because of the extensiveness of the Assessment Plan, a data management system becomes extremely important.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation. When revising the Plan, it would be beneficial to align each of the three student learning goals and 18 objectives with the course areas to be assessed each year. Currently, this cannot be discerned.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

	report ices (cited in annua blease describe)		Assessment plan (as posted Previous assessment review	*
Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Devon Hansen	Casey Ozaki
	Department	Marketing	Geography	Teaching & Learning
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	<u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	<u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u>
Coding Key:	Section 2:1	Y Section 3:Q Sectio	II 4: <i>Q</i>	
	•	appropriately and well (bearing in cyclical process, i.e., with additional actions and the cyclical process and the cyclical process and the cyclical process.)	1 0 ,	Č .
Q	= qualified yes as appropriately done	action or progress is apparent; ho	wever, evidence is lacking that	at this is completely and
N	= no, this is not do	one at all, or it is not done in relati	ionship to student learning	
NA	= no information r	reported and it's unclear whether	it was done	

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPART	TMENTMusic		DA	TE February 26, 201	4
PROGR A	AM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW	Bachelor of Music	in Music E	ducation	
COMMI ' Casey Ozo	TTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING aki	REVIEW_Mary	Askim-Lovs	eth, Devon Hansen, and	
1. STUDI	ENT LEARNING GOALS				
•		YESX_ YESX_ YESX_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments	y:				
	olor of Music in Music Education is one of for ant's programs are accredited by the National				t. The
program is	recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2 s differentiated by an additional goal and ob eeds of K-12 students. All goals as noted in t d.	jectives related to d	eveloping the	ability to teach music based	d on the
no degree	to the Assessment Plan, the course areas of assessments were noted on the timeline. The t objectives, two assessments were completed	Annual Report indi	cated that of	the four student learning go	als and 29
A.	ll students, vocal and instrumental, will performeried repertoire of literature for their instrument noted, it is assumed that the comprehensive	nent or voice at an d	appropriate l	evel of difficulty.	
(shown in X 1 1 X 2 X 3 4 5 X 6 X 7	a to the program goals, please also consider Using ment within parentheses) and identify we communication – written or oral ("able to 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking a Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reason Information literacy ("be able to access and 5 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of a 2 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to 3 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility be	which goals are simi write and speak in v (or "be intellectually g (or "be intellectually oning ("apply empiral d evaluatefor effectiversity and use that lifelong learning")	lar to program various setting y curious"; and ly creative"; rical dataar ctive, efficient t understand	n goals. gs with a sense of purpose/a nalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information at, and ethical use") ing")	udience")

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Specific examples of goals and objectives that relate to institutional and Essential Studies goals include—

Objective 4.4: Students will learn to write effectively about music.

Objective 2.2: Students will <u>analyze</u> written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music. Goal 3: Students will <u>express themselves creatively</u> through singing, playing instruments, and <u>improvisation/composition</u>, independently and with others.

Objective 1.7: Students will <u>demonstrate sensitivity to issues related to diversity in class, ethnicity and gender</u> in contemporary society.

Goal 2: Students will <u>develop life-long learning skills</u> in musical reading, listening, analysis, evaluation and synthesis that will enable them to learn new music independently, and recognize and pursue excellence in their musical experiences.

Objective 1.5: Students will <u>recognize teaching as a life-long dynamic and continuing process of development and growth.</u>

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Students take the Praxis I Pre-Professional Skills Test as sophomores. The test measures reading, writing, and mathematics skills; it is qualifier for a teacher education program. Praxis II is taken prior to student teaching (must pass to do the student teaching component of the program) and involves two components, content knowledge and pedagogy (phone conversation with Eric Tweton, Teacher Certificate Officer, 2/26/14). There are two Praxis I exams; one for K-6 and the other is 7-12 (phone conversation with Michael Wittgraf, Music Department Chairperson, 3/4/14).

A jury of faculty members were the assessment team for the performance skill objective; this is a direct assessment method.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. The Department may want to consider some student self-reporting surveys in the interim.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? We also be a second of the	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

As reported in the Annual Report, all students passed the Praxis exams; no data were provided to indicate areas of improvement in content knowledge and pedagogy. Over a three-year period, there was a 100 percent passage rate for Praxis I K-6 and a 78 percent passage rate for Praxis I 7-12; for Praxis II, the passage rate was 100 percent (phone conversation with Michael Wittgraf, Music Department Chairperson, 3/4/14).

No specific data were reported for the performance objective, but rather the statements—"Overall it was agreed that student performance ability as a whole is up for [sic] years past, but an unacceptably large group of substandard performers are still music majors." "... range from acceptable to the range of students passing juries is too wide (that too many low-achieving students are passing)." Since other Music programs also had performance objectives, these comments cannot be attached to any one program. Expectations may vary with each. It would beneficial to see the performance data differentiated by major.

any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for in the program presents findings, and, for in the program presents findings, and, for in the program of the pro	and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") luatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") ity and use that understanding") In glearning")
Comments regarding results and the application of results	to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_
directly address goals for student learning?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_
Comments:	
	al items will be "investigated." These include composition of jury the jury form (uniformity or not across departments), and the use of evaluation is currently more subjective).
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place	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 X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates X_ No results are reported X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Music Department still appears to be in the initial stages of assessing student learning. The focus has been on the process and should begin to target how to improve the students' learning. If there is still an "unacceptably large group of substandard performers," dialogue should begin on how to improve their performances. Changing the composition of the jury or the measurement instrument may not do so, as it was noted that assessment of this kind still has an element of subjectivity.

The Department should be more diligent in documenting the assessment results. Having valid and reliable data that is delineated by appropriate competencies will allow for targeting specific areas that need improvement. A general comment regarding students' performance abilities does not provide any insight into what attributes of performance need that improvement. As a result, it is difficult to initiate any pedagogical changes. The Department may want to consider some forms of formative assessment that would identify areas for improvement earlier in the students' program.

Because of the number of programs, the rotational method of assessment is a good management strategy. With the extensive number of student learning objectives within each program, the assessment process is more manageable. Because of the extensiveness of the Assessment Plan, a data management system becomes extremely important.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation. When revising the Plan, it would be beneficial to align each of the four student learning goals and 29 objectives with the course areas to be assessed each year. Currently, this cannot be discerned.

MATEI	RIALS	REVIEWED			
	appendio Other (pl (Phone	ces (cited in annual lease describe) e conversation w/E	l report)	X Assessment plan (as posted X Previous assessment review Teacher Certificate Officer, 2/20 8/4/14)	V
Reviewe	er(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail		Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu
Section	1: <i>Y</i> _	_ Section 2:Y	Section 3: <i>Q</i> Secti	ion 4: <i>Q</i>	
Coding 1	Y =			g in mind the kind of program(s) itional kinds of data to be collect	
	Q = 2	qualified yes as aappropriately doneno, this is not do	action or progress is apparent; hence at all, or it is not done in relaceported and it's unclear whethe		nt this is completely and

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

DEPARTMENTMusic		DA	TEFebruary 2	7, 2014
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWB	Bachelor of Music	in Music Th	nerapy	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING I Casey Ozaki	REVIEW_Mary A	Askim-Lovse	eth, Devon Hansen	, and
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YESX_ YESX_ YESX_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N	<u> </u>
Comments:				
The Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy is one of four program is accredited by the American Music Therapy		grams offered	l in the Music Depar	rtment. This
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2 was some elimination and adding of objectives with two differentiated by two additional goals and objectives real All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific posterior of the Assessment Plan, the course areas of an odegree assessments were noted on the timeline. The subsequent objectives, two assessments were completed Objective 5.1. All students, vocal and instrumental, will perform varied repertoire of literature for their instrument Though not noted, it is assumed that the comprehensive	o of the goals to be made to developing the competencies of the General Education Annual Report indication. One was a "comproper music with expression or voice at an agreement of the competency of the properties of the competency o	nore appropa "music there and were we attent that of rehensive as: ession and to ppropriate le	riate for the program upists who have clini ill articulated. bles" were to be eva the five student learn sessment" and the ot echnical accuracy fro evel of difficulty.	n), this program is cal experience." luated AY 2012-13 ning goals and 26 ther related to om a large and
In addition to the program goals, please also consider U (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify wX1 Communication – written or oral ("able to wX2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (X3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reaso5 Information literacy ("be able to access and6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of di?7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to li8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both)	thich goals are similar write and speak in varior "be intellectually (or "be intellectually ining ("apply empirical evaluatefor effectiversity and use that if elong learning")	ar to prograr arious setting curious"; a y creative"; cal dataar tive, efficier understandi	n goals. gs with a sense of pu nalyze, synthesize, ev explore, discover, en nalyze graphical info nt, and ethical use") ng")	rpose/audience") valuate) ngage)
Comments regarding program goals and alignment wi	ith institutional and	Feedutial S	tudios goals.	

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The "?" noted above indicates there was a student learning goal that could align with lifelong learning but inferences were needed. Students could develop lifelong learning skills but that is not indicative of a commitment to lifelong learning.

Specific examples of goals and objectives that relate to institutional and Essential Studies goals include— Objective 4.4: Students will learn to write effectively about music.

Objective 3.2: Students will <u>analyze</u> written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music. Goal 5: Students will express themselves creatively through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

Goal 3: Students will <u>develop life-long learning skills</u> in musical reading, listening, analysis, evaluation and synthesis that will enable them to learn new music independently, and recognize and pursue excellence in their musical experiences.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Students took the certification exam offered through the Certification Board for Music Therapists.

A jury of faculty members were the assessment team for the performance skill objective; this is a direct assessment method. Jury forms from past years were sampled. The jury, which represented different specializations (voice and instrumental), reviewed all and did not divide for appropriateness to their area.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. It is unclear how student teaching evaluations relate to the BM in Music Therapy degree as there is no student teaching component. The Department may want to consider some student self-reporting surveys in the interim.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <i>X</i> _	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? When the many least interest in the second control of the second c	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES	NO_ <i>X</i> _	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

All students passed the certification exam; no data were provided to indicate areas of improvement in any of the exam's content areas.

No specific data were reported for the performance objective, but rather the statements—"Overall it was agreed that student performance ability as a whole is up for [sic] years past, but an unacceptably large group of substandard performers are still music majors." "... range from acceptable to the range of students passing juries is too wide (that too many low-achieving students are passing)." Since other Music programs also had performance objectives, these comments cannot be attached to any one program. It would beneficial to see the performance data differentiated by major.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. 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 dataanalyze graphical information") 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:					
4. CLOSING THE LOOP						
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_					
directly address goals for student learning?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_					
Comments:						
	al items will be "investigated." These include composition of jury e jury form (uniformity or not across departments), and the use of evaluation is currently more subjective).					
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement					
A specific plan for assessment is in place. X_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.)	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 X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates X_ No results are reported X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)					

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Music Department still appears to be in the initial stages of assessing student learning. The focus has been on the process and should begin to target how to improve the students' learning. If there is still an "unacceptably large group of substandard performers," dialogue should begin on how to improve their performances. Changing the composition of the jury or the measurement instrument would not do so, as it was noted that assessment of this kind still has an element of subjectivity.

The Department should be more diligent in documenting the assessment results. Having valid and reliable data that is delineated by appropriate competencies will allow for targeting specific areas that need improvement. A general comment regarding students' performance abilities does not provide any insight into what attributes of performance need that improvement. As a result, it is difficult to initiate any pedagogical changes. The Department may want to consider some forms of formative assessment that would identify areas for improvement earlier in the students' program.

Because of the number of programs, the rotational method of assessment is a good management strategy. With the extensive number of student learning objectives within each program, the assessment process is more manageable. Because of the extensiveness of the Assessment Plan, a data management system becomes extremely important.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation. When revising the Plan, it would be beneficial to align each of the five student learning goals and 26 objectives with the course areas to be assessed each year. Currently, this cannot be discerned.

MATERIA	ALS REVIEWED			
	ual report endices (cited in annua r (please describe)		Assessment plan (as posted Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s)): Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.edu	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu
Section 1: _	Y Section 2:!	Y Section 3:Q Section	n 4: <i>Q</i>	
Coding Key Y	= yes, this is done	appropriately and well (bearing in a cyclical process, i.e., with additional approximately and well (bearing in approximately ap		
Q N N/	qualified yes asappropriately doneno, this is not do	action or progress is apparent; ho one at all, or it is not done in relat	ionship to student learning	at this is completely and

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

_DATE___*February 27, 2014*_____

DEPARTMENT__Music____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWBac	chelor of Music	in Perform	nance	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING RE	VIEW_ Mary 1	Askim-Lovs	seth, Devon Hansen, and	
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YESX_ YESX_ YESX_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments:				
The Bachelor of Music in Performance is one of four unde Department's programs are accredited by the National As				
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. Along with the foundational goals of the BA in Music, this program is differentiated by an additional goal and objectives related to developing the students' "musicianship and performing abilities in preparation for advanced study or a preforming career." All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.				
According to the Assessment Plan, the course areas of "A no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Ansubsequent objectives, one assessment was completed, God Students will develop their individual musiciansh.	nual Report indic al 1 (includes eig	cated that of ght objective	f the four student learning goals and 26 s).	
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UNI (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify whicX1 Communication – written or oral ("able to wriX2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (orX3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning – 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and ev6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of dive?7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifel 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both	ch goals are similate and speak in vertice and speak in vertice intellectually report of the intellectually report of the intellectual in the inte	lar to progra various settin y curious"; a ly creative"; ical dataa ctive, efficie t understand	m goals. ngs with a sense of purpose/audience") nalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use") ing")	
Comments regarding program goals and alignment with	institutional and	d Essential S	Studies goals:	

The "?" noted above indicates there was a student learning goal that could align with lifelong learning but inferences were needed. Students could develop lifelong learning skills but that is not indicative of a commitment to lifelong learning.

Specific examples of goals and objectives that relate to institutional and Essential Studies goals include—

Objective 4.4: Students will learn to write effectively about music.

Objective 2.2: Students will <u>analyze</u> written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music. Goal 3: Students will <u>express themselves creatively</u> through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

Goal 2: Students will <u>develop life-long learning skills</u> in musical reading, listening, analysis, evaluation and synthesis that will enable them to learn new music independently, and recognize and pursue excellence in their musical experiences.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

fic assessment methods referenced?	YES <i>X</i> _	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
so, were specifically chosen assessment ethods appropriately aligned with individual			
pals?	YES <i>X</i>	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Vere both direct and indirect assessment lethods used as components of a "multiple leasures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX
	so, were specifically chosen assessment ethods appropriately aligned with individual oals? Vere both direct and indirect assessment	so, were specifically chosen assessment ethods appropriately aligned with individual oals? YES_X_ Vere both direct and indirect assessment ethods used as components of a "multiple YES	so, were specifically chosen assessment ethods appropriately aligned with individual oals? YES_X_ NO Were both direct and indirect assessment ethods used as components of a "multiple YES NO

Comments:

A jury of faculty members were the assessment team for the performance skill objective; this is a direct assessment method. Jury forms from past years were sampled. The jury, which represented different specializations (voice and instrumental), reviewed all and did not divide for appropriateness to their area. Since this degree focuses on performance, there should be different standards to assess this ability. There was no mention in the Annual Report of a different jury form being used for the students in this program.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. It is unclear how student teaching evaluations relate to the BM in Music Performance degree as there is no student teaching component. The Department may want to consider some student self-reporting surveys in the interim.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
• 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	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

No specific data were reported for the performance objective, but rather the statements—"Overall it was agreed that student performance ability as a whole is up for [sic] years past, but an unacceptably large group of substandard performers are still music majors." "...range from acceptable to the range of students passing juries is too wide (that too many low-achieving students are passing)." Since other Music programs also had performance objectives, these comments cannot be attached to any one program. It would seem likely that the expectations would be higher in the BM in Performance program. It would beneficial to see the performance data differentiated by major.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate
any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.
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 dataanalyze graphical information")
5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment

Strengths

results repor	rted?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
•	If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
Comments:				
panels (shoi	closing the loop activities were noted, but severall they judge outside their area of expertise), the les or written rubrics for assessment (it appears ditions."	ne jury form (unij	formity or n	ot across departments), the use of

SUMMARY

nent is in place.
not well-articulated.
ot clearly described.
1

Areas for Improvement

- ____Assessment methods are appropriately selected. _____Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. ______Assessment methods are not well-implemented. ______X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- _____Results are reported. _____X_ No results are reported.
- Results are tied to closing the loop.

 (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

 Z Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.

 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Music Department still appears to be in the initial stages of assessing student learning. The focus has been on the process and should begin to target how to improve the students' learning. If there is still an "unacceptably large group of substandard performers," dialogue should begin on how to improve their performances. Changing the composition of the jury or the measurement instrument would not do so, as it was noted that assessment of this kind still has an element of subjectivity.

The Department should be more diligent in documenting the assessment results. Having valid and reliable data that is delineated by appropriate competencies will allow for targeting specific areas that need improvement. A general comment regarding students' performance abilities does not provide any insight into what attributes of performance need that improvement. As a result, it is difficult to initiate any pedagogical changes. The Department may want to consider some forms of formative assessment that would identify areas for improvement earlier in the students' program. It is suggested to develop a different jury form/rubric for assessing the students in this program regarding their performance abilities as it would be expected that their skill level should exceed those in the BA in Music and BM in Music Education programs.

Because of the number of programs, the rotational method of assessment is a good management strategy. With the extensive number of student learning objectives within each program, the assessment process is more manageable. Because of the extensiveness of the Assessment Plan, a data management system becomes extremely important.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation. When revising the Plan, it would be beneficial to align each of the four student learning goals and 26 objectives with the course areas to be assessed each year. Currently, this cannot be discerned.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

	al report ndices (cited in annua (please describe)		Assessment plan (as posted Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.edu	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 <u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u>
Section 1:	Y Section 2:1	/_ Section 3: <i>Q</i> Sectio	n 4: <i>Q</i>	
Coding Key:				
Y	•	appropriately and well (bearing in cyclical process, i.e., with additional approximation) appropriately and well (bearing in approximately and approximately app		
Q	• /	action or progress is apparent; ho	wever, evidence is lacking that	at this is completely and
N	11 1	one at all, or it is not done in relati	ionship to student learning	
NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done				

DEPARTMENTMusic]	DATE	February 27, 2014
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWMaster	of Music in (Composition	ı (Special	ization)
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EWMary	y Askim-Lov	seth, Dev	on Hansen, and
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N FIED Y/N FIED Y/N
Comments:				
The Master of Music in Composition (Specialization) is one of program is accredited by the National Association of Schools			fered in th	e Music Department. This
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-0 objectives that focus on preparing students for a career in couthe Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and we	mposition or a	arranging, or		
No assessment of student learning goals for this program was	s completed fo	or AY 2012-13	3.	
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS				
Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YESX	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N
goals?	YES_X_	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YES	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/NX_
Comments:				
No reference was made to this graduate program in the Annu indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted assessment methods were student teaching evaluations and at the specialization being composition, it is unclear how the use goals.	l of composition of evaluation f	ons, tests, rese form designed	earch pape by the Mi	ers, and projects. Indirect usic Department. Based on
3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS				
Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO_X_	QUALII	FIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? If so, were the results clear in terms of how 	YES	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N
they indicate need for improvement?Were the results tied to goals for student	YES	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N
learning?	YES	NO	QUALII	FIED Y/N

Comments:

4. CLOSIN	G THE LOOP					
Were any ac results repor			YES	NOX_	QUALI	FIED Y/N
•	changes arising from	assessment results for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALI	FIED Y/N
Comments:						
SUMMARY				A	C T	
	Strengths			Areas j	for Impro	vement
A specific plan for assessment is in place. X_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.) 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 methods are reported. Results are reported. Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)					t well-articulated. clearly described. appropriately selected. well-implemented. nethods predominates.	
OVERALI	L SUMMARY ANI	O RECOMMENDATIO	NS:			
student learn Composition	ning in the graduate pa (Specialization) will	orts, the Music Department rograms. If the assessment be assessed this year, AY 20 dent learning goals and ob	timeline follo 013-14. If ass	ws its past pa essment of a p	ttern, the program i	
posting on th	he University's website	ssment timeline noted in the e. Rather than just updating ns for competencies upon g	the timeline			Plan should be updated for fthe current plan still meets
MATERIA	LS REVIEWED					
X_ Other	nal report ndices (cited in annual r (please describe) nnual Report, AY 2016	-		essment plan (ious assessme		
Reviewer(s)	: Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.ea	Ge 7-4	evon Hansen eography 1587 von.hansen@	und.edu	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: Y	Section 2:	Y	Section 3:	NA	Section 4:	NA

Coding Key:

Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)

Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

DEPARTMENTMusic			DATE <i>February 27, 2014</i>
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWMaster	of Music in	Conducting	(Specialization)
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	IEW Mar	y Askim-Lov	seth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_	NO NO NO	
Comments:			
The Master of Music in Conducting (Specialization) is one of program is accredited by the National Association of Schools			ered in the Music Department. This
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-0 objectives that focus on "developing a student's individual m performance or teaching career." All goals as noted in the As articulated.	usicianship a	nd conducting	g abilities, in preparation for a
No assessment of student learning goals for this program was	s completed f	or AY 2012-13	3.
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS			
Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
goals?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:			
No reference was made to this graduate program in the Annu indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted methods were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation	of tests, reci	tals, applied j	uries, and papers. Indirect assessment
3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS			
Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO_ <i>X</i> _	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? If so, were the results clear in terms of how 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Coi	mn	nen	ts:

4. CLOSIN	G THE LOOP					
Were any acresults report	tions taken on the bas	is of assessment	YES	NO_X_	QUALI	FIED Y/N
•	If so, do curricular or changes arising from	other improvements/				
		s for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALI	FIED Y/N
Comments:						
SUMMARY					· •	
	Strengths			Areas f	for Impro	vement
X_StudentAssessnAssessnDirect aResultsResults (Decisi OVERALI In reviewing student learn Conducting (it is importan	previous Annual Repaing in the graduate possible of the graduate possible of the fact that all student lear demic year of the asse	ell-articulated. rly described. ropriately selectedimplemented. re implemented. loop. vidence.) D RECOMMENDATIO orts, the Music Department rograms. If the assessment the e assessed this year, AY 2016 ning goals and objectives a ssment timeline noted in the	Student Assesser Assesser Assesser Assesser Asingle No resu Results (Decision NS: historically had inteline follow 14-15. If assesser assessed at the Assessment P	learning go nent method nent method nent method e type of ass lts are repor are not clea- on-making is as provided is s its past pa- sment of a po- that time.	als are not directly tied to a solution of the area of	done on a four-year rotation,
		e. Kainer inan just upaating ns for competencies upon gi		or reviews, c	onsiaer ij	ine current plan still meets
MATERIAI	LS REVIEWED					
X_ Annu	al report ndices (cited in annua	roport		sment plan (
X Other	ndices (ched in annua (please describe) nual Report, AY 2010	•	A_ FIEVIO	ous assessine	iii ieview	
Reviewer(s):		Mary Askim-Lovseth		on Hansen		Casey Ozaki
	Department Phone Number	Marketing 7-2930	Geo. 7-45	graphy 87		Teaching & Learning 7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.ed		<u>n.hansen@ı</u>	<u>und.edu</u>	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: Y	Section 2: Y	Section 3: NA	Section 4: NA

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports $\underline{\textbf{GRADUATE PROGRAMS}}$

DEPARTMENTMusic			_ DATE February 27, 2014
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWMaster	of Music in	Music Educ	ration (Specialization)
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEW Mar	y Askim-Lo	vseth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_ <i>X</i> _ YES_ <i>X</i> _ YES_ <i>X</i> _	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:			
The Master of Music in Music Education (Specialization) is a This program is accredited by the National Association of Sc			ms offered in the Music Department.
The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-0 objectives that focus on "developing a student's individual m performance or teaching career." All goals as noted in the A articulated.	usicianship a	nd conductin	g abilities, in preparation for a
No assessment of student learning goals for this program was	s completed f	or AY 2012-1	3.
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS			
Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES_ <i>X</i> _	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:			
No reference was made to this graduate program in the Annu- indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted methods were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation	l of tests, reci	itals, applied	juries, and papers. Indirect assessment
3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS			
Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO_ <i>X</i> _	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	VFS	NO	OUALIFIED Y/N

4. CLOSIN	G THE LOOP						
Were any ac results repor	If so, do curricular or changes arising from	other improvements/			QUALIFIED Y/N		
Comments:	directly address goals	s for student learning:	1E3	NO	QUALITED 1/N		
SUMMARY	Y Strengths			Areas f	for Improvement		
A specific plan for assessment is in place X_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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIO In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department			No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) ONS: the historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of ter of Music in Music Education program was to be assessed AY				
posting on th	he University's websit		the timeline fo		-13. The Plan should be updated for consider if the current plan still meets		
MATERIA	LS REVIEWED						
X_ Other	nal report ndices (cited in annua r (please describe) nual Report, AY 2010			sment plan (ous assessme			
Reviewer(s)	: Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.ed	Geog 7-45	on Hansen graphy 87 <u>n.hansen@t</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 und.edu carolyn.ozaki@und.edu		

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

Coding Key:

Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)

Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTM	IENTMusic]	DATE <i>February 27, 2014</i>
PROGRAM	I(S) COVERED IN REVIEWMaster	of Music in F	Pedagogy (S	pecialization)
COMMITT Casey Ozaki	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EW Mary	Askim-Lov.	seth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDEN	T LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YESX_ YESX_ YESX_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
	f Music in Pedagogy (Specialization) is one of si accredited by the National Association of Schools			ed in the Music Department. This
objectives tha	ently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-0 tt focus on "developing a student's applied teach applied music teacher." All goals as noted in the	ning abilities a	nd individua	l musicianship, in preparation for a
2012-13 acco The following Stud The Assessme	ent Plan timeline indicated the MM in Pedagogy ording to the Annual Report. One assessment was is the Goal as stated in the Annual Report (white ents will develop their individual musicianship are the Plan states a different Goal 1 for the programents will develop their pedagogical and perform	s completed, Coch is the same and performing n.	Goal 1. The G as for the M g abilities to	ioal differs between the two documents M in Performance).
2. ASSESSM	MENT METHODS			
•	cific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment	YES <i>X</i>	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_

Comments:

Juries were used to assess the performance goal; this is a direct measure. Since juries are used for the undergraduate programs, too, a different measurement instrument should be used for the graduate performances as quality expectations would be higher. There was no mention if different benchmarks were used in the assessment. Though other direct assessment methods (i.e., tests, papers) were identified in the Assessment Plan for Goal 1 for the six objectives, none others were noted in the Annual Report.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. Indirect assessment methods to be used were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department. The Department may want to consider some student self-reporting surveys in the interim.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS YES____ NO__*X*_ QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Were any assessment results reported? If so, were the results clear in terms of how NO___ they specifically affirm achievement of goals? QUALIFIED Y/N YES If so, were the results clear in terms of how QUALIFIED Y/N _ they indicate need for improvement? NO YES Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Comments: The noted comment was, "It has been acknowledged by music faculty this year that the M.M. in Pedagogy degree program may be producing substandard performers." This subjective statement was not substantiated by any data and the "may be" wording infers no data were analyzed. Goal 1 has nine student learning objectives and no specific competencies were addressed. 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Comments:

results reported?

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment

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

No specific closing the loop activities were noted, but only the statements that some faculty questioned the "usefulness of the degree" and that the faculty will be investigating its viability.

YES_____ NO_X_ QUALIFIED Y/N ____

YES_____ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ____

SUMMARY

Strengths Areas for Improvement A specific plan for assessment is in place. ____ No specific plan for assessment is in place. __X_Student learning goals are well-articulated. ____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated. ____ Assessment methods are not clearly described. ____Assessment methods are clearly described. ____Assessment methods are appropriately selected. ____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. __X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented. _Assessment methods are well-implemented. __X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates. Direct and indirect methods are implemented. _Results are reported. __X_ No results are reported. __X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.) (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs. It is recommended that the Department be more diligent in following through with its Assessment Plan as it provides the input for how to improve student learning and to determine if the students have acquired the needed competencies. If separate jury forms/rubrics are not used for the graduate performances, it is recommended they be developed.

With only one of the two goals being assessed for the program, it would be eight years between the assessment of each goal (if one goal was selected each four-year cycle). This would not provide adequate information for trying to improve student learning.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website if the Department decides to continue the MM in Pedagogy.

MATERIALS	REVIEWED			
X Other (1	report ices (cited in annua blease describe) al Report, AY 2010	l report)2	X_ Assessment plan (as postedX_ Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 <u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 <u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u>
Section 1:Y	Section 2:1	Y Section 3:NA Secti	on 4: <i>NA</i>	
Q N	that assessment is a = qualified yes as appropriately done = no, this is not do	appropriately and well (bearing in a cyclical process, i.e., with additing action or progress is apparent; however, and the standard and it is not done in relative available and it's unclear whether	onal kinds of data to be collect wever, evidence is lacking that ionship to student learning	cted in other years)

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPART	MENTMusic			_DATE <i>February 27, 2014</i>
PROGRA	.M(S) COVERED IN REVIEWMa.	ster of Music in I	Performanc	e (Specialization)
	TTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING R	EVIEW Mary	Askim-Lov	vseth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDE	NT LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
	of Music in Performance (Specialization) is a accredited by the National Association of Sch			ffered in the Music Department. This
objectives th performanc	ecently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 20 that focus on "developing a student's individu te career or teaching at the University level." es and were well articulated.	al musicianship ar	nd performing	g abilities, in preparation for a
AY 2012-13	nent Plan timeline indicated the MM in Perfo Baccording to the Annual Report. One assess Endents will develop their individual musicians	ment was complete	ed, Goal 1.	
2. ASSESS	SMENT METHODS			
Were any sp	pecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individuals.	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
_	goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_

Comments:

Juries were used to assess the performance goal; this is a direct measure. Since juries are used for the undergraduate programs, too, a different measurement instrument should be used for the graduate performances as quality expectations would be higher. There was no mention if different benchmarks were used in the assessment. Though other direct assessment methods (i.e., tests, papers) were identified in the Assessment Plan for Goal 1 for the nine objectives, none others were noted in the Annual Report.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. Indirect assessment methods to be used were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department. It is unclear how student teaching evaluations relate to the MM in Performance degree as there is no student teaching component. The Department may want to consider some student self-reporting surveys in the interim.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS Were any assessment results reported? YES NO_*X*_ QUALIFIED Y/N ____ If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? NO YES QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Were the results tied to goals for student NO____ learning? YES QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Comments: The noted comment was, "Results are satisfactory." This subjective statement was not substantiated by any data. Though performances were satisfactory, with data collected and aligned with each of the nine student learning objectives, there would be more insight into determining the students' level of proficiency with each of the competencies. For example, Objective 1.4 states "Vocal students will demonstrate knowledge and application of (at least) German, French, and Italian Diction." It may be that students do better with French diction than German, indicating an area of improvement needed. 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:

It was stated that no change was needed.

SUMMARY

Strengths 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.
X_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates
X_ No results are reported.
X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs. It is recommended that the Department be more diligent in following through with its Assessment Plan as it provides the input for how to improve student learning and to determine if the students have acquired the needed competencies. If separate jury forms/rubrics are not used for the graduate performances, it is recommended they be

With only one of the two goals being assessed for the program, it would be eight years between the assessment of each goal (if one goal was selected each four-year cycle). This would not provide adequate information for trying to improve student learning.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation.

MATERIALS	REVIEWED			
X Other (p	report ices (cited in annua blease describe) al Report, AY 2010	l report)2	X_ Assessment plan (as postec X_ Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.edu	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 <u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u>
Section 1: <i>Y</i> _	Section 2:1	Y Section 3: <i>NA</i> Secti	on 4: <i>NA</i>	
Q N	that assessment is a = qualified yes as appropriately done = no, this is not do	appropriately and well (bearing in a cyclical process, i.e., with additing action or progress is apparent; however, and at all, or it is not done in relative available and it's unclear whether	onal kinds of data to be collect wever, evidence is lacking that ionship to student learning	cted in other years)

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports <u>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPART	MENTMusic			DATE February 27, 2014
PROGRA	M(S) COVERED IN REVIEWDocto	or of Philosoph	y in Music	Education
	TTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	VIEW Mary	v Askim-Lov	eseth, Devon Hansen, and
1. STUDE	NT LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
	of Philosophy in Music Education is one of six g d by the National Association of Schools of Mus			
objectives th	cently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004 hat focus on "enabling students to produce inde in music programs at any level." All goals as no rticulated.	pendent scholar	rship and tea	ch in higher education, or to provide
Stu	Report indicated that both program goals were udents will develop their understanding of Musiculants will consolidate their general knowledge	Education to the		
2. ASSESS	SMENT METHODS			
• If so	pecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	goals?		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_

Comments:

The dissertation, a direct measure, was used to assess both goals. Though other direct assessment methods (i.e., tests, projects, research papers) were identified in the Assessment Plan, none others were noted in the Annual Report. The dissertation, itself, would not be an appropriate assessment method for all of the nine student learning objectives. For example, Objective 1.4 states "Students will develop understanding of the place of Music in the broader context of Education." The student's educational experiences are the Teaching & Learning courses and assessment measures should be aligned with capturing this understanding.

No indirect methods were reported, though the Assessment Plan noted collecting such data in a five-year cycle. Indirect assessment methods to be used were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department. It is unclear how student teaching evaluations relate to the PhD in Music Education degree as there is no student teaching component. Since few are in the program, an exit interview may be more beneficial in gaining feedback.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS Were any assessment results reported? YES____ NO__*X*_ QUALIFIED Y/N ____ If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES____ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N ____ Comments: No results were reported for the one dissertation defense. 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: Another defense occurred Fall 2013. This will provide additional data for the program.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

Sucus	The cas for improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place X_Student learning goals are well-articulated Assessment methods are clearly described Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	 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 well-implementedDirect and indirect methods are implementedResults are reportedResults are tied to closing the loop.	X_ Assessment methods are not well-implementedX_ A single type of assessment methods predominatesX_ No results are reportedX_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs and has relied on singular measures. It is recommended that the Department be more diligent in following through with its Assessment Plan as it provides the input for how to improve student learning and to determine if the students have acquired the needed competencies. This a relatively new program so multiple measures should be used to strengthen what it offers students.

The last academic year of the assessment timeline noted in the Assessment Plan is 2012-13. The Plan should be updated for posting on the University's website. Rather than just updating the timeline for reviews, consider if the current plan still meets students' needs and the expectations for competencies upon graduation.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

X_ Annual report Appendices (cited in annual report)X_ Other (please describe) (Annual Report, AY 2010-11)			X_ Assessment plan (as posted)X_ Previous assessment review			
Reviewer(s):	•	Mary Askim-Lovseth Marketing 7-2930 maskim@business.und.edu	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 <u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u>	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu		
Section 1:	Y Section 2:Y		n 4: <i>N</i>			
Coding Key:						
Y	= yes, this is done	appropriately and well (bearing a cyclical process, i.e., with addit				
Q	= qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done					
N NA	= no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning					