1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)

MUSI 3610 Choral Conducting I and MUSI 3630 Instrumental Conducting I

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:

MUSI 3610: The work of all 9 students enrolled was assessed for SLO 7. MUSI 3630: The work of all 16 students enrolled was assessed.

3. Assessment Method(s): Explain how assessment for this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole-was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method.)

SLO 7 will be assessed in MUSI 3610 Choral Conducting I and MUSI 3630 Instrumental Conducting I. Every music major takes one of these classes. Vocal and piano majors take Choral Conducting I, and instrumental majors take Instrumental Conducting I during the fall semester of their junior year. All students in each class will be assessed. Competency in the SLO measures is assessed in three peer teaching experiences throughout the semester for each student. Conductors must use verbal communication in addressing and responding to their music ensemble. This verbal communication is what is being assessed. The Music Department Assessment Committee has developed a rubric for assessing students’ ability to effectively communicate (see rubric on page 1 of the attachment). The rubric provides for scores for components based on the individual measures of the SLO. The rubric will be used to assess each student presentation. The assessment committee will collect the rubrics for each class. Average component scores will be calculated to discern students’ ability to master the objectives and to see whether improvement is being made throughout the semester. Discussion of the assessment results will take place during the department’s annual assessment meeting. Recommendations will be decided as a result of the discussion. Instructors have been asked to include the SLO and measures in their syllabi. The assessment committee developed course objectives based on the measures for this SLO (see below). These objectives have been provided to the instructors for use in their syllabi. The instructors have been asked to incorporate these objectives in the description of assignments portion of the syllabus. Initial assessment of this SLO began in Fall 2012. Course Objectives 1. Students will demonstrate clear and effective verbal communication skills. 2. Students will demonstrate use of appropriate language free from bias in an ethical and credible manner. 3. Students will develop an awareness of appropriate opportunities and methods for verbal communication during rehearsals. 4. Students will demonstrate direct and effective verbal communication skills in multiple settings. 5. Students will demonstrate active listening skills and respond appropriately to feedback.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:

In order to clarify that our assessment method is measuring student success in oral communication, two sentences were added to the second paragraph of the assessment method description. Our original 5-point scale rubric was used for the 2012-13 assessment period because data based on this rubric was collected in fall semester 2012, before the CCGEC’s request for a change to a new rubric based on a 4-point scale. We converted the average scores of the original rubric to a 4-pt. scale for purposes of comparison to future results. We began using the new rubric for the 2013-14 assessment period.
5. Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO7, indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this course:

intermediate

6. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)

All students in each class were assessed for a total of 25 students. Students show high basic or intermediate level of competencies in all areas. See page 2 of the attachment for data. Strengths include: • Use of appropriate language free from bias • Ability to make credible comments which indicates strong knowledge of subject matter • Ability to listen and respond to feedback from instructor Areas for improvement include: • Ability to recognize appropriate opportunities and methods for communication • Ability to communicate candidly and effectively Students do show overall improvement in their ability to communicate over the course of the three assignments during the semester. They are generally successful in achieving the course objectives and improving over the course of the semester. The lowest overall average component score concerns students’ ability to communicate candidly and effectively; however, it was also the area in which students made the most improvement throughout the semester. In comparing scores from Fall 2013 to Fall 2012, there is more consistency between classes in Fall 2013. In Fall 2012, it appeared to the committee that the standards might not be the same for each class. Before the semester began, both instructors met to discuss the application and specific intent of each measure. What looks like a lowering of scores in class 1 could be attributed to the pre-semester discussion.

7. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement? (What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this discussion? The findings will occur at the department’s winter assessment meeting in December. The committee will recommend that instructors focus on two specific areas in the conducting classes for the next assessment period. Measures 2 and 3 will be the focus with the specific rehearsal applications noted below.

• Recognizing appropriate opportunities for communication in rehearsals requires a student conductor to effectively detect performance errors. Instructors will assess each student’s ability to detect and respond appropriately to errors in performance. • It is not unusual for students to be reluctant to communicate needs for improvement to their peers in a rehearsal setting, but his is an important skill for conductors to learn. Faculty will be encouraged to strengthen this skill. Instructors will be asked to focus on these two measures and provide students with specific feedback that will aim to improve students’ abilities in these areas.

8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

The data for the 2012-13 assessment period was collected at the completion of fall semester 2012, before the CCGEC developed comprehensive rubrics to align with each core SLO. Since the two courses being assessed are only offered during fall semesters and the rubrics for each assignment were completed by the course instructors throughout the semester, the committee analyzed the data for 2012-13 based on the original rubric (see attached) which used a 5-point scale. The committee felt that since the original rubric was closely aligned to the SLO 7 measures, the findings were relevant. The average scores using the 5-point scale were then converted to a 4-point scale to provide a basis for comparison to future results. The new rubric (see attached) based on the comprehensive CCGEC rubric was used in the 2013-14 assessment period. Though the comparison presents
some probable inaccuracies, we believe the process was useful. Future comparisons with equal data will be more informative.

9. Committee Comments