

# Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2011-2012

Please address the questions below  
send to [learningassessment@pcc.edu](mailto:learningassessment@pcc.edu) by **June 22, 2012**; with Annual Report in the subject line

*Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C (LDC/DE) or 6B (CTE) of the Program Review Outline.*

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome assessments carried out in 2010-2011. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.

*Last year the Music SAC focused on the assessment of the outcomes of Communication and Cultural Awareness. Applied lesson students are now required to complete historical, cultural and geopolitical research as an integral part of the repertory study. In the past students often only knew the title and composer of the material they were learning – last year's activity elucidated the fact that having a cultural and historical perspective creates richer experiences for the performer and for the listener. No large changes were made regarding non-verbal communication in music performance. This is something the SAC attempted to assess last year but was quite difficult to do with novice or even intermediate ability. This assessment activity reinforced the fact that effective communication in music performance requires a relatively high level of musicianship; something we strive to achieve in all applied lesson students through music juries and concert performances.*

## **For each outcome assessed this year:**

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:
  - The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).

## **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**This assessment included a musical performance in an assisted living center by the Rock Creek choirs. It allowed the students to perform as a community service for a historically underserved segment of our Portland metro community. Upon completion of the event, students were asked to reflect upon the experience through written responses to several questions. These questions were created with the PCC core outcome rubric for *Environmental and Community Responsibility* in mind, with an emphasis on the aspect of community due to the context of the event. This allowed us to quickly gauge if students were affective and attentive to their roles as musicians in our community.**

## **Professional Competency\***

**This activity included the assessment of end-of-term music performances by vocal and instrumental ensembles and applied lesson soloists completed by PCC LDC music transfer faculty. Applied lesson music juries were assessed as well.**

**\*LDC Music study is one of a handful of pre-professional programs at the undergraduate level. Although this outcome is usually reserved for CTE program the Music SAC felt it was an integral outcome.**

The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?

### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**At Rock Creek, the Choirs are the most well attended music classes and represent our best opportunity to sample students who have a primary focus in music. In all, the assessment activity involved over 40 students involved in various choir and activities at Rock Creek. Although this sample is significantly smaller than the overall student body served in Music by Rock Creek, it seemed the best way to get a controlled sample. Also, it acted as a perfect opportunity for the choirs to perform community service.**

### **Professional Competency**

**This cohort of students forms the bulk of enrollment in both music major/minor transfer and general education courses.**

Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.

### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**As stated above, the student responses were given a number grade by the Rock Creek music faculty in accordance with the Core Outcome rubric posted on the PCC website. Upon reading the students reflections, this rubric allowed us to quickly assign a numerical 'score' to each paper, and allowed us to get a sense for the broader scope of our students' community responsibility in a quantitative way.**

### **Professional Competency**

**A six-level scale was used to measure competency in music technique, tone production/intonation, musicianship and suitability of repertory. This was done in accordance with professional standards set by the National Associations of Schools of Music.**

- How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another).

### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**The results were analyzed as stated above. Each reflection was read and judged in relation to the rubric, then given a numerical score. As the only FT faculty member in music, I read every report, so this limited diversity of the results.**

### **Professional Competency**

**NASM standards were reviewed and agreed upon for this activity during the SAC inservice meeting. Music faculty completed the evaluations.**

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?
  - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.
  - Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results.

#### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**In general, students showed a basic understanding of their role in the community, basic ideas of the service they were providing, and also had a few ideas about possible solutions to the problems facing the community they were performing for. However, few of the students seemed to express the breadth of understanding and critical thinking in this subject necessary to garner a level 4 from the rubric.**

#### **Professional Competency**

**Major/minor level applied lesson students largely measure at high end of professional competency. This reinforces role of music juries to measure applied lesson standards. The few exceptions that demonstrate developing competency, or need for remedial work, are a natural result of the music program's open enrollment/non-audition admission policy. Music juries serve to mitigate this policy.**

**Instrumental and vocal ensembles reflect the more diverse student body enrolled in these courses. The ensembles requiring audition and/or music literacy demonstrate a higher level of competency.**

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

#### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**We believe that a primary goal should be to get the students out performing at these kinds of events more often. This provides several important functions. First, our music students need to be getting out in public more often, and additional performances are crucial to success in music performance. Second, these performances, if scheduled properly at appropriate venues, could assist in students gaining a natural and organic understanding for their role in the community.**

#### **Professional Competency**

**Auditions would help reduce the number of under prepared students for study at the music major/minor level. This has been discussed during recent SAC meetings and will continue to be visited.**

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

#### **Community and Environmental Responsibility**

**We believe that this was a fairly effective evaluation process. Primarily, the only problem was the size of the sample (many students did not return their responses by the date needed), and the quantity of events. I believe a future use of this same assessment should include GRADED (i.e. required) response to the questions we supply, and also the inclusion of several events throughout the school, so that the assessment is based on a much broader experience.**

#### **Professional Competency**

**This assessment activity has been occurring for years in the form of music juries and performances although not in a cross campus systematic approach as was done this year. This activity highlighted the effectiveness of having adjudicators from multiple campuses and music performance areas (vocal and instrumental). Ideally the actual applied lesson instructors should also be included in the jury process. This is an ongoing, larger challenge of using non-PCC employee/faculty members as applied lesson instructors. This is something that should be addressed in the future.**



## PCC Music Program Music Jury Evaluation

*to be filled out by student*

Student Name	Level	Private Instructor	Date
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Ensemble(s) currently enrolled	Music Major or Minor	Planned Degree Program
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Applied Music Credits Currently Taken	Primary Instrument or Vocal Range
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Prepared Performance Piece(s) (Title and Composer – full name with dates)	Memorized?
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Additional Repertoire and Etude Work This Term (Title and Composer – full name with dates)

*to be filled out by adjudicator*

Tone:

Technique: (as applicable to instrument: articulation, fingering, facility, rhythmic accuracy, diction)

Musicianship: (phrasing, interpretation, musical effect)

Scales:

Comments:

Jury Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Adjudicator Signature \_\_\_\_\_

PCC Music Performance Assessment  
Professional Competency

Performer(s):

Date:

Composition:

---

Rate each item 1-6 scale (1 = developing, 6 = professional level)

-Tone production/Intonation:

-Musicianship (execution of dynamics, articulation and appropriate phrasing):

-Technique:

Is the repertoire at the appropriate level?

Comments:

PCC Music Performance Assessment  
Professional Competency

Performer(s):

Date:

Composition:

---

Rate each item 1-6 scale (1 = developing, 6 = professional level)

-Tone production/Intonation:

-Musicianship (execution of dynamics, articulation and appropriate phrasing):

-Technique:

Is the repertoire at the appropriate level?

Comments: