**2009 Assessment Report Feedback – Music**

**Assessment Committee Contact**: Vicki Baker, Economics & Management

*\*Note*: The assessment report/feedback was reviewed/provided by Vicki Baker, Mark Bollman, and Scott Hendrix

You have done an excellent job with this assessment report.  I learned a great deal about the program, courses, and various options offered by the Music department. I offer some feedback below to help you further enhance what you have provided, but you are well on your way to having a solid assessment program in the Music departments.

*Step 1: Mission*

Your mission statement is clear and very much in line with the College’s mission. In fact, the fact your mission statement discusses student actions and goals/outcomes, which is good.

*Step 2: Outcomes*

I see that you have broken out the outcomes for the three options in your department (major in music, music education, and music performance emphasis). If that works for your department, great.  But, that is a lot to assess (e.g., a lot of outcomes to achieve and to assess to determine if you are achieving).  I suggest that you find common outcomes across these three areas and perhaps go with just those.  This is only a suggestion, so do not feel as though you need to do this.

One possible way to organize your outcomes is as follows: outcomes into 2-3 categories (e.g., basic knowledge/history; performance, technique, and technology; independent/advanced knowledge and performance—just guesses!), and focus initial assessment efforts on one of the categories… Or, select 2-3 key outcomes from the longer list and start with these few outcomes. (Another means of focusing assessment efforts—while at the same time simplifying, reducing workload—would be to concentrate on one major at a time.)

*Step 3: Program Components*

You have a great matrix here that links the outcome to the assessment procedures/class it is associated with (when assessed).  You need to take this matrix one step further by providing specific examples of activities, exams, performances, portfolios, etc. to show HOW these outcomes are achieved (simply listing the course is not enough).  You do not need to do this for EVERY class listed, rather select a few for each outcome and then list an activity that is associated with that class to illustrate how the outcome is being achieved.  I can certainly help if you have questions.  *Given you need to do this, you may want to reduce your number of outcomes as suggested in Step 2 above, but I leave that up to you*. I do think that the use of a matrix is helpful, but is not being used or presented as effectively as it could/should be. In addition, as presented, the numbers of outcomes do not match up in Step 2 and Step 3: a minor point, but one that is a bit confusing (and probably easily explained and amended).

*Step 4: Methods/Data*

You have a great direct measure of assessment (The Sophomore Jury).  If you have more opportunities to engage in this type of assessment on any scale, please do so to supplement this activity.  You do, however need to incorporate some examples of indirect assessment measures which could include student focus group, surveys (alumni, graduating senior), placement/graduation rates, and grades. Below is some more detail that differentiates the differences between direct and indirect measures.

In assessing student learning, there are direct and indirect sources of evidence. Direct evidence is clear and convincing information about student learning, such as: tests, examinations, papers, projects, assignments, field experience assessments, and portfolios. These are particularly strong sources of evidence especially when accompanied by articulated standards (such as a rubric). On the other hand, with indirect evidence there is room for other factors to affect the outcomes either positively or negatively. Examples of indirect evidence include: retention, graduation, and placement rates (may be impacted by economic conditions or college policies); surveys of students and alumni (may indicate feelings about college experience); grades (standards and even content may differ across instructors and institutions).

In your next round of revisions, please incorporate how you plan to address the above in Step 4 and then update your matrix to incorporate the recommendations in Step 3. Overall, great job on this first round!