

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

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 25, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Bachelor of Arts in Music

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Bachelor of Arts in Music is one of four undergraduate programs offered in the Music Department. The Department's programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The BA in Music provides the foundational student learning goals and objectives for three of the four undergraduate programs. 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 – General Education, Ensembles" were to be evaluated AY 2012-13; no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Annual Report indicated that of the three student learning goals and 18 subsequent objectives for the program, Objective 3.1 was assessed during the academic year.

All students, vocal and instrumental, will perform music with expression and technical accuracy from a large and varied repertoire of literature for their instrument or voice at an appropriate level of difficulty.

In addition to the program 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 program 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")
 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 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 2.4: Students will learn to write effectively about music.

Objective 1.2: Students will analyze written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music.

Goal 3: Students will express themselves creatively through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

Goal 2: Students will develop life-long learning skills 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__X__	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:

A jury of faculty members were the assessment team; 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 BA in Music 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/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 specific data were reported, 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 be 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 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 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/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 X

Comments:

No specific closing the loop activities were noted, but several items will be “investigated,” all related to the process. These include composition of jury panels (should they judge outside their area of expertise), the jury form (uniformity or not across departments), and the use of numeric scales or written rubrics for assessment (it appears evaluation is currently more subjective).

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

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

☒ Annual report

☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)

☐ Other (please 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☒ Q ☐ N Section 4: ☒ Q ☐ 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 and analyzed 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 reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

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

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 26, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Bachelor of Music in Music Education

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Bachelor of Music in Music Education is one of four undergraduate programs offered in the Music Department. The Department's programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

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 ability to teach music based on the learning needs of K-12 students. 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 – General Education, Ensembles" were to be evaluated AY 2012-13; no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Annual Report indicated that of the four student learning goals and 29 subsequent objectives, two assessments were completed. One was a "comprehensive assessment" and the other related to Objective 3.1.

All students, vocal and instrumental, will perform music with expression and technical accuracy from a large and varied repertoire of literature for their instrument or voice at an appropriate level of difficulty.

Though not noted, it is assumed that the comprehensive assessment related to the competencies required for teacher education (Goal 1).

In addition to the program 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 program goals.

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

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 analyze written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music.

Goal 3: Students will express themselves creatively through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

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

Goal 2: Students will develop life-long learning skills 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 recognize teaching as a life-long dynamic and continuing process of development and growth.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? 	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 a 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 ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES____	NO__X__	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 be 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 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 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/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 X

Comments:

No specific closing the loop activities were noted, but several items will be “investigated.” These include composition of jury panels (should they judge outside their area of expertise), the jury form (uniformity or not across departments), and the use of numeric scales or written rubrics for assessment (it appears evaluation is currently more subjective).

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

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.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☒ Other (please describe)
(Phone conversation w/Eric Tweton, Academic Advisor/Teacher Certificate Officer, 2/26/14)
(Phone conversation w/Michael Wittgraf, Chairperson, 3/4/14)

☒ 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: Q Section 4: Q

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 and analyzed 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 reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

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

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy is one of four undergraduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the American Music Therapy Association.

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. Along with the foundational goals of the BA in Music (there was some elimination and adding of objectives with two of the goals to be more appropriate for the program), this program is differentiated by two additional goals and objectives related to developing "music therapists who have clinical experience." 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 – General Education, Ensembles" were to be evaluated AY 2012-13; no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Annual Report indicated that of the five student learning goals and 26 subsequent objectives, two assessments were completed. One was a "comprehensive assessment" and the other related to Objective 5.1.

All students, vocal and instrumental, will perform music with expression and technical accuracy from a large and varied repertoire of literature for their instrument or voice at an appropriate level of difficulty.

Though not noted, it is assumed that the comprehensive assessment related to the competencies identified in Goals 1 and 2.

In addition to the program 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 program 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")
 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 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 analyze 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 develop life-long learning skills 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 ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? 	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? 	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__

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__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES____	NO__X__	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 be 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 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 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/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 ___X_

Comments:

No specific closing the loop activities were noted, but several items will be “investigated.” These include composition of jury panels (should they judge outside their area of expertise), the jury form (uniformity or not across departments), and the use of numeric scales or written rubrics for assessment (it appears evaluation is currently more subjective).

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

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.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☒ Q ☐ N Section 4: ☒ Q ☐ 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 and analyzed 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 reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

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

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Bachelor of Music in Performance

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Bachelor of Music in Performance is one of four undergraduate programs offered in the Music Department. The Department's programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

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 performing 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 – General Education, Ensembles" were to be evaluated AY 2012-13; no degree assessments were noted on the timeline. The Annual Report indicated that of the four student learning goals and 26 subsequent objectives, one assessment was completed, Goal 1 (includes eight objectives).

Students will develop their individual musicianship and performing abilities to the highest possible level.

In addition to the program 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 program 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")
- 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 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 2.2: Students will analyze written musical scores of works from the entire historical range of western music.

Goal 3: Students will express themselves creatively through singing, playing instruments, and improvisation/composition, independently and with others.

Goal 2: Students will develop life-long learning skills 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 ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? 	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? 	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__

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/N __X__
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES____	NO__X__	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 be 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 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 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/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 X

Comments:

No specific closing the loop activities were noted, but several items will be “investigated.” These include composition of jury panels (should they judge outside their area of expertise), the jury form (uniformity or not across departments), the use of numeric scales or written rubrics for assessment (it appears evaluation is currently more subjective), and “stricter and earlier entrance auditions.”

SUMMARY

Strengths

_____ 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.)

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:

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

☒ Annual report

☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)

☐ Other (please describe)

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)

☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Mary Askim-Lovseth</i>	<i>Devon Hansen</i>	<i>Casey Ozaki</i>
	Department	<i>Marketing</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Teaching & Learning</i>
	Phone Number	<i>7-2930</i>	<i>7-4587</i>	<i>7-4256</i>
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: Q Section 4: Q

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 and analyzed 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 reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Music in Composition (Specialization)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Master of Music in Composition (Specialization) is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on preparing students for a career in composition or arranging, or advanced study. All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

No assessment of student learning goals for this program was completed for AY 2012-13.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

No reference was made to this graduate program in the Annual Report, but the Assessment Plan identified both direct and indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted of compositions, tests, research papers, and projects. Indirect assessment methods were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department. Based on the specialization being composition, it is unclear how the use of student teaching evaluations relates to the student learning goals.

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:

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:

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs. If the assessment timeline follows its past pattern, the Master of Music in Composition (Specialization) will be assessed this year, AY 2013-14. If assessment of a program is done on a four-year rotation, it is important that all student learning goals and objectives are assessed at that time.

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):	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	devon.hansen@und.edu	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

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Music in Conducting (Specialization)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Master of Music in Conducting (Specialization) is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on “developing a student’s individual musicianship and conducting abilities, in preparation for a performance or teaching career.” All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

No assessment of student learning goals for this program was completed for AY 2012-13.

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 this graduate program in the Annual Report, but the Assessment Plan identified both direct and indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted of tests, recitals, applied juries, and papers. Indirect assessment methods were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department.

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:

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:

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs. If the assessment timeline follows its past pattern, the Master of Music in Conducting (Specialization) will be assessed this year, AY 2014-15. If assessment of a program is done on a four-year rotation, it is important that all student learning goals and objectives are assessed at that time.

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):	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	devon.hansen@und.edu	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

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Music in Music Education (Specialization)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Master of Music in Music Education (Specialization) is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on “developing a student’s individual musicianship and conducting abilities, in preparation for a performance or teaching career.” All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

No assessment of student learning goals for this program was completed for AY 2012-13.

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 this graduate program in the Annual Report, but the Assessment Plan identified both direct and indirect assessment methods. The direct assessment consisted of tests, recitals, applied juries, and papers. Indirect assessment methods were student teaching evaluations and an evaluation form designed by the Music Department.

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:

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:

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ 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.)

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:

In reviewing previous Annual Reports, the Music Department historically has provided minimal data regarding assessment of student learning in the graduate programs. Though the Master of Music in Music Education program was to be assessed AY 2012-13, no assessment activities were reported.

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):	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	devon.hansen@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

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Music in Pedagogy (Specialization)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Master of Music in Pedagogy (Specialization) is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on “developing a student’s applied teaching abilities and individual musicianship, in preparation for a career as an applied music teacher.” All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

The Assessment Plan timeline indicated the MM in Pedagogy was to be assessed AY 2011-12, but instead was assessed in AY 2012-13 according to the Annual Report. One assessment was completed, Goal 1. The Goal differs between the two documents. The following is the Goal as stated in the Annual Report (which is the same as for the MM in Performance).

Students will develop their individual musicianship and performing abilities to the highest possible level.
The Assessment Plan states a different Goal 1 for the program.

Students will develop their pedagogical and performing abilities to high levels.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

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

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:

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

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:

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.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ___ 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.)

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 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

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☒ Other (please describe)
(Annual Report, AY 2010-11)

☒ 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	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

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master of Music in Performance (Specialization)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Master of Music in Performance (Specialization) is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on “developing a student’s individual musicianship and performing abilities, in preparation for a performance career or teaching at the University level.” All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

The Assessment Plan timeline indicated the MM in Performance was to be assessed AY 2011-12, but instead was assessed in AY 2012-13 according to the Annual Report. One assessment was completed, Goal 1.

Students will develop their individual musicianship and performing abilities to the highest possible level.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

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?	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:

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

- ___ 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.)

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 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. 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

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☒ Other (please describe)
 (Annual Report, AY 2010-11)

☒ 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	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

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Music **DATE** February 27, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Devon Hansen, and Casey Ozaki

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 Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education is one of six graduate programs offered in the Music Department. This program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The first dissertation defense occurred Spring 2013.

The most recently posted Assessment Plan was for AY 2004-05. The program has two student learning goals and related objectives that focus on “enabling students to produce independent scholarship and teach in higher education, or to provide leadership in music programs at any level.” All goals as noted in the Assessment Plan addressed specific competencies and were well articulated.

The Annual Report indicated that both program goals were assessed.

Students will develop their understanding of Music Education to the highest possible level.

Students will consolidate their general knowledge of musical scholarship and research and approaches to this study.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

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

___ 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.)

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 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

☒ Annual report

☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)

☒ Other (please describe)

(Annual Report, AY 2010-11)

☒ 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	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

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

Revision 9/25/13