1. What program outcomes were addressed?

In answering this question, please identify the specific program outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

A. Enrollment and graduation rates in the MM Music Education degree were assessed. This was necessary as it was quite clear that administration was looking at elimination of the program. Since the CWU Music Department has the reputation as the primary music education institution in the state, the current state of the MM Music Ed. program did not line up with our Vision Statement which says:

The Department of Music will be recognized and respected for its challenging curriculum and supportive environment, for the excellence of its student, ensemble and faculty performances, and for the fulfillment of its motto: “Where Teaching is a Performing Art.”

In addition, the CAH Strategic Goal says:
Create and maintain high quality academic programs

Goal 1 of the CWU Strategic Plan has as it’s last bullet this statement:
Clarify the role, function, and desirable size of graduate education at CWU

Given how all of these goals line up, it was an obvious step to assess the MM Music Education program for its viability and redirection.

B. Adequate course offerings for all graduate student programs were assessed. As part of the final oral exam in all graduate degrees, the question is asked: “what do you see as needing improvement in the graduate program in the music department?” The persistent issue raised in nearly every case was that there were not enough courses offered for graduate students to have choices. A side issue was that the scheduling of graduate courses was not consistent so students were unable to plan ahead and have an accurate Course of Study.
Clearly, the current state of music course offerings for graduate students was lacking and not in line with one of the Core Values of the department.

Hold each student's greatest good as our primary concern.

We also were not fully satisfying the first CAH Student Learning Goal:
Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competencies for success in their field.

Current practice also placed the department out of line with Goal 1 of the CWU Strategic Plan, which has as its last bullet this statement:
Clarify the role, function, and desirable size of graduate education at CWU.

In order to meet the goals above, assessment of the way graduate courses were being offered in music was an obvious step.

2. **How were they assessed?**

In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing the program. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

A. Enrollment data from the past decade was consulted. Anecdotal evidence pertaining to degree concentration was considered. We considered our own admission policies for the MM Music Ed degree as well as evolving requirements by the state of Washington for advanced degrees for K-12 educators.

B. Past course schedules were cross-referenced with the course catalog to determine what courses had been offered and when. Analysis of faculty strengths were done to determine who might be able to teach graduate-level courses coupled with working knowledge of faculty workloads.

3. **What was learned?**

In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

A. Enrollment data showed, on average, one student admitted to the MM Music Ed program each year, which resulted in one graduate, on average, each year. The anecdotal evidence showed us that even graduate students with BM Mus Ed degrees (that were qualified for and could have selected the MM Music Ed) almost always chose either Performance or Conducting as their concentration. We learned that there are many causes for these trends. First is that the complexion of the requirements for K-12 music educators to obtain an advanced degree has changed to the point that it is no longer necessary, as defined by the state, to possess an advanced degree in the same discipline, or sub-discipline, as the bachelor degree, i.e. a master's degree in any discipline or sub-discipline, is acceptable. Those students that did choose to attend here went with degree programs in Conducting or Performance...
because they felt that those programs would better fit with their aspirations and educational needs. Second, and perhaps more telling are our admission requirements that are not realistic for the vast majority of students, namely, the requirement to have taught for at least 2 years in a K-12 setting. This requirement also plays into another barrier for prospective students: our degree is for residential students only. Active K-12 educators, i.e. those with jobs, find it very difficult to give up the income and security of a full-time job for a year or two, to pursue an advanced degree. Also with this policy, our resident undergraduate students do not have the option of continuing into the Master of music education degree once they graduate with their bachelor's degree, so they choose other available tracks like conducting. With these two facts in mind, by design, the master of music education degree was destined to have very low numbers.

B. Past scheduling of graduate courses showed that there was little consistent pattern to what and when graduate courses had been offered. In fact, it appeared as if offerings were determined more on the whims of faculty (or when they might have some extra load) rather than any sort of long-term plan that could benefit students.

4. **What will the program/department do as a result of that information?**

   *In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.)*

A. A new summers-only MM Music Education was created for implementation during summer 2012. Music Education faculty studied what other institutions are offering, informally polled K-12 music educators in the field as to their needs and wants, experimented with a number of scheduling matrix options, and took our existing degree requirements into account. The result is a three-summer cohort, with three tracks: instrumental, choral and elementary. With this summer only option, teachers currently in the profession will be able to maintain their employment. Also, since it is a three summer program, current students will be eligible to be provisionally accepted into this program (provided that they have found employment) and still meet the two year teaching requirement before they complete their masters degree. The program is being promoted through advertisements in the Washington Music Educators Journal, the Oregon Music Educators Journal, the department web site, a mass mailing to over 30,000 prospective students throughout the country, and by word of mouth. The reaction has been overwhelmingly positive and the department anticipates this first cohort to be 12-15 graduate students, nearly the number that we usually have enrolled in all graduate programs during an academic year. Summer 2013 will see the second cohort started while the first cohort returns for
their second year, doubling the enrollment. Summer 2014 will be the start of the third cohort while the second and first cohorts return to campus. Once all three cohorts are implemented the program is expected to sustain itself with three cohorts in rotation each summer. One measure of success will be enrollment numbers over time, but the department also plans to survey students in each cohort for feedback about the program. After cohorts have graduated, the department plans to track students in their K-12 assignment for 1) the effectiveness of the program to improve their teaching and 2) their relative success in the profession as measured by administrative evaluations and the demonstrated success of their students.

B. As part of the overall department overhaul of the scheduling of classes, possible instructors were determined for courses in the current catalog and logical days/times/terms were determined for when to offer graduate courses. In addition, undergraduate courses with graduate cross-listed courses were identified and additional possible cross-listing opportunities were determined, with new courses proposed through the catalog process. The department expects that residential graduate students will be able to better plan their Course of Study and will find consist and reliable scheduling of graduate-level courses that are both relevant and desirable. The department plans to implement a post-degree survey to determine the effectiveness of the course offering strategy.

5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year’s assessment?

The assessment for 2009-10 was “students will develop graduate level writing skills”

A. The department graduate committee met throughout the year to discuss possible revisions in MUS 700 requirements to develop more clarity as to the expected outcome and product that students were to produce.

B. The department graduate coordinator met with all graduate students each term of 2010-11 to keep them informed of:

a) Thesis & non-thesis project report general regulations
b) Written cover papers for non-thesis projects
c) Music department graduate student/committee chair (check list - timeline of due dates)
d) Identifying students who need tutorial help with writing skills