

# LDC Program Review – Annual Discipline Update for 2021-2022

## PART A

### SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: **Music**

Disciplines included in this SAC: **MUS and MUP**

SAC Chair(s): **Jason Palmer and Samuel Barbara**

Faculty Department Chair(s): **Jason Palmer, John Mery, Julianne Johnson**

Program Dean/ SAC Administrative Liaison: **Gene Flores**

Pathway Dean: **Daniel Wenger**

Please highlight where your classes are offered.

Classes/Services offered at: **CA / RC / SE / SY / NB / HC / WCC / Metro / CLIMB**

Other:

## SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

**All data cited below can be found here:**

<https://www.pcc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/program-profiles/>

\*\*\*Note the row of Tabs just below your Bookmarks Bar. Begin on the Home Tab. This is where you will choose your selection criteria for your data. Return to the Home Tab whenever you want to change your selection criteria. See the Help and Data Dictionary Tabs as well as the Data Directions Document included in the email with this template for more information.

Please include data from at least the last three years and up to the last five years. A 3-year enrollment review is recommended. SACs may have unique circumstances and reasons for looking more or less broadly.

2A.Enrollment (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality

**SEE Student FTE Tab**

2A1. Does this data suggest any questions that the SAC would like to pursue?

The effects of the COVID pandemic have been incredibly impactful on the music program. Music is a social experience and often an activity that combines visual, aural, tactile, and participatory learning. Playing an instrument or performing in an ensemble are very difficult online. Although we moved many activities to a remote modality at the beginning of the COVID pandemic, some activities proved to not be productive online. Courses such as Symphonic Band (MUS195a-f), Chamber Music Ensemble (MUS158a-f) were canceled outright. Others were cancelled as the pandemic progressed when they proved to not be viable in a remote modality, such as Vocal Jazz Ensemble (MUS165a-f), Jazz Ensemble (MUS166a-f). Last, a few courses have been returned to face to face instruction through the COLT process for Fall and Winter 2021-2022, such as Chorus (MUS220a-f) and Chamber Choir (MUS221a-f). However, the loss of these performance ensembles has had a great impact on our enrollment. As noted in our full A/B year ADU (from 2019/2020), the MUS/MUP program had been experiencing growth through the years leading up to the pandemic:

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 179.7

2017-2018 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 218.6

2018-2019 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 232.5

However, once we hit the period of the pandemic, these numbers decline:

2019-2020 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 189.8

2020-2021 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 155.1

This trend mirrors our enrollment in student performing ensembles (these numbers include all performance ensemble combined):

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 16.9  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 29.7  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 36.9  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 19.7  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 11.7

Interestingly, when we look at enrollments for OL courses (i.e. a portion of our program that is entirely online and asynchronous i.e. not overtly affected by the pandemic), we see this:

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE MUS OL = 67.5  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE MUS OL = 72.7  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE MUS OL = 71.6  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE MUS OL = 64.2  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE MUS OL = 62

There are several ways to look at these two trends (enrollments in ensemble classes vs enrollments in OL classes). Obviously, we would expect OL courses to be less impacted by the pandemic as they are disseminated online, while ensemble courses work best in a face to face format.

However, we feel that there is another way to look at this trend. Not only were ensemble classes affected by the pandemic, through cancelations, lower enrollment, and lack of interest, but the music program as a whole saw enrollment declines during this period. Obviously, some of this is due to college-wide enrollment declines and the cancelation of some ensembles as mentioned above. However, ensembles actually generate a relatively small amount of FTE (due to most of them being 1cr classes), so this enrollment decline can't be completely connected to ensembles. Our sense is that the vibrancy and vitality of the program and it's ensembles brings students to the college who then take other music classes, and other classes in general. When our program was larger, active, and vibrant (2017-2019), enrollments in all music classes were higher as there was more activity and engagement with music students in general.

There are several types of music students. A first type is the 'elective-type' music students who are likely pursuing another career path and are looking to complete a Gen Ed requirement using a music course, typically in an OL and asynchronous manner. This trend was little changed by the pandemic. A second type of student is the career-focussed music student, who will likely take many of the face to face and ensemble classes with the goal of transferring as a music major. Obviously, these classes were greatly affected by the pandemic, both in our overall enrollment trends and in the individual classes. However, a third type of student that typically gets forgotten in these types of discussions is the student who is a hybrid of these two cohorts,

a student who may not plan to major in music, but would like to continue participating and enjoying making music, perhaps after beginning music studies during their K-12 education. A recent conversation with the band director at Century High School (which has over 200 students in their music program) ended with the simple question, “Does PCC have a band for my student to play in when they transfer.” When both the career-focussed students (group 2) and this third group that I just mentioned are allowed access to a rich and varied music education that involves many ensembles and ways to participate, our program has flourished. For example, in the 18-19 academic year, we offered the most ensembles we had ever offered, as well as creating many real-world musical events (i.e. performances, tours, concerts, recordings). This year demonstrated the highest SFTE that the MUS/MUP program had seen in over a decade. But, interestingly, this year showed a slight decrease in the enrollments in OL courses. To us in the music program, this shows that a vibrant and quality in-person musical experience is what many students are seeking when they leave large regional high school music programs focussed in band and choir.

In summary, for our SAC, the question this brings up is how do we rebuild the larger, vibrant, active program that we had before the pandemic, while also acknowledging the new reality of an increased desire among students and the community at large to have access to flexible and hybrid models of learning. We feel strongly that recreating a cohort of active, engaged, in-person music students is critical to the well being of the program. The question is how best to do this given the current state of in-person learning, college-wide enrollment declines, and the strategic needs (but also opportunities) inherent within the college reorganization process.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments be made in your discipline, such as schedule or course offerings, with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with in the upcoming academic year?

The importance of community, connection, and musical performance are of obvious importance for music students. Upon reflecting on the data above, it appears that courses which have always been purely online and which cater to GenEd-seeking students were basically unaffected but the pandemic, while music courses which depend on community, connection, and live music performance were greatly affected when those attributes were lost with the move to remote learning. These courses historically contain both music career oriented students and elective students (such as MUS220 Chorus and MUS166 Jazz Ensemble) and they showed immediate enrollment losses, even when the courses were sustained through remote learning:

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 16.9  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 29.7  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 36.9  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 19.7  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE combined performance ensembles = 11.7

Additionally, as music students were not able to create the sense of community with in-person music making, the enrollments in other periphery courses (which typically populate when a critical mass of music students are attending the college, as mentioned above) were also affected, such as piano students (MUS190, 191p, 192p, 193p) and guitar students (MUS191/192/193). Below, we see the increase in enrollments as the program grew through 2016-2019, then a decline during the pandemic. We believe this is notable given that these courses are not always directly tied to music 'majors' and in some cases are not required for degree transfer. We believe these enrollment declines are more a product of the cross pollination of many different types of music students attending the program, seeing the activity, and choosing to join in and participate. With remote learning and the effects of the pandemic, there has been a dramatic effect.

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE piano courses = 17  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE piano courses = 17.2  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE piano courses = 19.3  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE piano courses = 12.7  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE piano courses = 8.3

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE guitar courses = 10.6  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE guitar courses = 13.7  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE guitar courses = 12  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE guitar courses = 14.1  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE guitar courses = 9.5

So, as mentioned above, we believe that the single most important and critical question and change that we can make at this time is to safely and intentionally, but also swiftly, strategize a way to recreate the activity, vibrancy, and diversity of the music activities that we were engaging in during AY 2017-2019.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the SAC/discipline?

No

2A4. Is your program aware of any external influences that strongly affect recent enrollment? For example, state requirements, transferability challenges, other university policies, etc. Please explain.

Again, the effects of the COVID pandemic have been incredibly impactful on the music program. As mentioned above, although we moved many activities to a remote modality at the beginning of the COVID pandemic, some activities proved to not be productive or possible online. Therefore, the combination of some course cancellations, loss of student access to face to face music activities (thus accelerating declining interest in participation in general), and loss of the sense of on-campus community that allowed for recruitment and retention all contributed to a steep decline in enrollment. Our hope is that we will be able to reclaim this enrollment as we return to in-person activities.

2016-2017 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 179.7  
2017-2018 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 218.6  
2018-2019 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 232.5  
2019-2020 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 189.8  
2020-2021 College Wide SFTE MUP/MUS = 155.1

## 2B. Course Success Rates

*Data Definition: Success rate represents the percentage of students who successfully complete a course. It is calculated as:*

$$\% S = \frac{\text{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, P, PR, or CM}}{\text{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, W, PR, CM, N, UP}}$$

*PR, CM, N, and UP are non-credit grades used in the Adult Basic Education program.*

*Success rates for gender and race are not calculated when the enrollment is less than 5. For any success rate that is not calculated, the total for that column is also not calculated.*

### **% Success By Course and Modality**

#### **SEE Modality Tab**

2B1a. Are there any courses with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

The introductory music theory course, Intro to Music MUS101, has historically low success rates and significantly lower rates than other music classes:

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 63.1  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 66.5  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 59.8  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 65.2  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 67.5

Reasons for this and possible solutions will be discussed below in section 2B2 'Strategy Insights', although it is interesting to note that these success rates are improving over time.

This trend of lower success rates is somewhat mirrored in another of our introductory music theory courses, Fundamentals of Music MUS110, although to a lesser degree:

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 71.8  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 74.1  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 75.3  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 77.3  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 71.4



Again, this trend seemed to improve over time, with a significant drop at the time of the pandemic, which we will discuss in 2B2, below.

As students move into the primary music theory sequence MUS111, MUS112, and MUS113, this trend of lower success rates improves dramatically:

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 88  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 86.9  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 84.1  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 81.6  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 85.2

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 81.6  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 89.1  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 95.5  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 76.2  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 77.1

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 93.5  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 83.7  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 90.3  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 89.7  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 95.5

However, there is still room for growth here and we will discuss strategies for the music theory sequence as a whole in section 2B2, below.

A few other notable outliers:

MUS205 and MUS216 have significantly lower success rates in comparison to other similar GenEd OL classes offered in the same modality.

Again, as mentioned earlier, music ensemble courses have statistically higher success rates due to their sense of community, group accountability, and faculty mentorship.

Last, MUP courses have overall much higher success rates. This is an example of how intentional 1 to 1 mentorship helps students attain success. Although this program generates a small amount of FTE, we feel that the learning and practice/self-assessment skills developed in the MUP program help students succeed in other areas of their college experience and their life.

2B1b. Are there any modalities with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

In general, our SAC finds that pass rates are higher for in-person classes (including hybrid), slightly less for remote, and significantly less for OL. These trends hold true for several years, with the obvious exception that we only have data for Spring 2020 through Fall 2021 in regards to remote classes.

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUP/MUS =  
In-Person 83.4%, OL 73.4%

2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUP/MUS =  
In-Person 84.9%, OL 78.6%

2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUP/MUS =  
In-Person 88.2%, Hybrid 88.5%, OL 74.2%

2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUP/MUS =  
In-Person 86.6%, Hybrid 74.7%, Remote 82.7%, OL 76.8%

2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUP/MUS =  
In-Person (none), Remote 84%, OL 72.9%

A more specific and interesting example is that MUP (private 1 on 1 lessons in instrumental and voice performance) have the highest success rates in our program.

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUP = 94.9%

2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUP = 95%

2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUP = 92.3%

2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUP = 92.8%

2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUP = 94.1%

## 2B2. Strategy Insights

What strategies have you used to maintain high success rates? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates? What are possible actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? Please clearly explain how your discipline intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

The sense of community, accountability, and 'belonging' that students experience in face to face music classes (especially performing ensembles and instrumental classes) creates an environment of success. People become part of a group of musicians who are typically working together towards a specific goal. Additionally, they have regular access to instructors and mentors, which leads to success. Finally, practicing and performing music is a social activity that bonds individuals to one another and encourages group work, study/practice sessions outside of class, and self-assessment of skill development.

We believe that it is important to note that the years of our SACs highest overall enrollment in face to face activities (AY 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20 before the pandemic) were also the years of highest success rates overall in our SAC. We believe that this is due to the strong sense of community, accountability, and support that our cohort experienced as the program grew, along with frequent contact with faculty mentors who were readily available to students on campus.

For the OL modality (which typically has lower success rates, especially in MUS216) there are several actions we would like to take. First, we would like to encourage our instructors to creatively identify ways that OL music courses can be more interactive, collaborative, and engaging. This seems to work for our face to face and (in some areas) our remote classes, so this seems to be an obvious area for growth in our OL classes. Also, specifically working with the instructors for our OL courses with the lowest success rates and reaching out to offer mentorship and coaching may be necessary. These may be possible through the faculty assessment process, but a more informal approach may help and be less intimidating to the instructors.

In regards to the success rate trends that we see in our music theory introductory and sequence courses, we have several thoughts:

Intro to Music MUS101 has the lowest success rates in the sequence. This course is a basic introduction to music theory and notation for the non-musician. However, it is also offered only in the OL modality. Given that the information is a mix of intellectual, aural, visual, and in some cases tactile (if you are playing an instrument...) learning, it may be necessary to review the course materials to see if there are ways to bridge the gap in students' learning. Perhaps the OL modality is not the best way to impart this information? Or, potentially there are ways to expand the curriculum to better utilize technology to help students hear and understand the information. Last, many musical examples that are typically used in courses of this type or drawn from the Western European classical tradition. A more inclusive and representative set of musical examples, drawn from styles of music more global, current, and culturally diverse may help to draw students into the course and find higher levels of success. Since there are only a few instructors who typically teach this course, our SAC will endeavor this year to reach out to these instructors to see what changes can be made.

When we move to the Music Fundamentals MUS110 course, the situation becomes more complicated. Originally, the MUS101 Intro course (mentioned above) was designed as the online version of MUS110. The MUS110 course has been historically seen as a more hands-on version of the introductory materials, in contrast to the online MUS101 course. We can see that this more hands-on approach garners better success rates:

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 63.1  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 66.5  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 59.8  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 65.2  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS101 = 67.5

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 71.8  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 74.1  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 75.3  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 77.3  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS110 = 71.4

Also, we can see that when MUS110 was moved to a remote modality because of the pandemic, these success rates declined. Also, an important note and statistically confusing fact is that the MUS110 offerings have also included one OL version since 2018.

Finally, when we begin to look at MUS111, MUS112, and MUS113, we see the success rates stabilize and the rates do improve as the sequence advances through the 2-year of the sequence (MUS211A, MUS212A, MUS213A). Most notable is the lower rates in the first two terms of the sequence. Although not as low as the MUS101 class, these first two terms (111, 112) could likely be improved. This material is quite challenging for students, especially those with less background in music performance. Later this year, we will be working with the SONic Arts SAC to potentially re-work and format the music theory courses to potentially align and offer one sequence throughout the college. Our hope is that this process will allow us to correct the issues of success rates throughout the sequence.

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 88  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 86.9  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 84.1  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 81.6  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS111 = 85.2  
2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 81.6  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 89.1  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 95.5  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 76.2  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS112 = 77.1  
2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 93.5  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 83.7  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 90.3  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 89.7  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS113 = 95.5

2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS211A = 90  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS211A = 95.5  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS211A = 100  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS211A = 90.5  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS211A = 95  
2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS212A = 90  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS212A = 100  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS212A = 93.8  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS212A = 86.7  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS212A = 94.1  
2016-2017 College Wide Success Rates MUS213A = 100  
2017-2018 College Wide Success Rates MUS213A = 85.7  
2018-2019 College Wide Success Rates MUS213A = 100  
2019-2020 College Wide Success Rates MUS213A = 85.7  
2020-2021 College Wide Success Rates MUS213A = 94.1

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics  
**SEE Gender, Race, and Pell Tabs**

2B3. The data may indicate a pattern of inequities (in gender, race, or Pell eligibility) in student enrollment or success. Please clearly explain how your program intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

In keeping with the mission of the college to foster diversity, equity and inclusion and to provide opportunities for historically underprivileged groups, the music department plans to engage in culturally responsive teaching. There is a lack of diversity among the student population at the Rock Creek campus and, as such, further effort must be made to recruit BIPOC students. Over the next year, we will expand our recruitment activities to involve a more diverse set of students. On the westside, particular attention will be paid to Aloha and Forest Grove High Schools, where the student populations are majority hispanic. Efforts will also be made to connect with inner city schools, like Jefferson and Roosevelt, where larger minority populations exist.

In addition to expanded recruitment efforts, we intend to undertake a project that addresses the issue of systemic racism in policing. The work, "Seven Last Words of the Unarmed," is in seven movements, each of which is based on the last words spoken by 7 black men who were killed by police. Each of the tragic stories and their texts are detailed on the project website (<https://sevenlastwords.org/>). In addition to performing the work, we feel it is important to engage BIPOC students and faculty in the performance of the work. Efforts will first be made to reach current PCC students, but with the knowledge that such connections may be difficult to establish and that a particular skill set is needed to perform the work, we will plan to bring in outside artists to diversify the performing ensemble. We will also work with the musicians union to attempt hiring BIPOC string players and soloists. Additionally, we feel it is important to partner with community organizations that can assist us in better understanding the work and presenting it as sensitively as we possibly can. In the process, it is hoped that some of these community partners might come into our classes to engage the student performers in important dialogue around the issue. Lastly, we would hope to engage in pre-concert talks so that the audience enters in with a full understanding of the text and the situation surrounding each of the men who were killed. Proceeds from the concert will benefit one or more of our community partners and possibly even the newly created Foundation scholarship for BIPOC students.

2B4. What support does your SAC need to fully explore inequities in enrollment or student success? For example, are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success?

We believe that the college has many resources available to faculty and SACs as they work on this important topic, but feel at times unqualified to properly analyze this complex data, given the nature of our professional training. Additionally, we feel that assistance in identifying ways to change these numbers or improve conditions for students may help. Last, we feel that a move back to campus could be productive for students in that they would have more easy access to student services such as the various support centers and wrap-around services that the college was so focussed on developing before the pandemic.

## SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

### 3A. Assessment Reports

Please note: The following questions link directly to your Annual Learning Assessment Reports for the Learning Assessment Council. Feel free to cut and paste between this document and your other assessment documentation.

3A1. Which student learning outcomes from your SAC's available courses will you assess this year and will you use direct assessment strategies?

*(These can be larger, program-level outcomes or course-level outcomes from your CCOGs).*

We will assess the A&L Integrative Learning General Education Outcome.

3A2. Which courses do you plan to assess this year; how and why will your SAC choose the sections?

We will assess all MUS Gen Ed courses.

3A3. In general terms, describe the assessment project for the year from implementation to data collection. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?

Last year, we used our assessment to create a 'dry run' of the MUS Gen Ed signature assignment process. We were assessing the outcome of IL but also we are assessing the signature assignments as well.

After last years experience, and being given the reprieve of not having to officially start that process this year, our hope is to re-run our signature assignments, but provide some coaching on what types of assignments and formats seemed to be most successful last year so that instructors can edit and update their signature assignments with the idea of re-assessing this year to see whether or not we have improved our process.

Steps:

- 1) Fall 2021 Inservice meeting SAC decided to re-assess IL outcome in MUS Gen Ed courses.
- 2) Late Fall term 2021: disseminate info to instructors that they can update and edit signature assignments with an eye towards improving them from last year
- 3) Winter 2022 MUS Gen Ed courses use signature assignment. Student work will be collected at the end of term by having each instructor redact artifacts and submit to SAC chairs.
- 4) Spring 2022 MUS SAC members that volunteer as scorers will be normed during the Spring in-service meeting. Student artifacts will then be scored. Information will be collected and summarized in our assessment report.



### 3B. Response to LAC Assessment Question

Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SAC's 2020-2021 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

**Commendations:** Thank you for testing out your own assignments using the GenEd rubrics! Clearly you were able to find some useful and interesting information. This sort of work at the SAC level is exactly what was hoped when the idea of Signature Assignments was developed. Thank you also for facilitating such wide participation in the scoring of artifacts.

**Suggestions:** We appreciate seeing the disaggregated data and encourage you to use it to improve on different aspects of the signature assignments across your GenEd course. The SAC's plan to continue assessing signature assignments after making changes is an excellent next step. Please keep in mind that if you change the assignments or assessment tools, it is a new assessment, not a reassessment - a reassessment must rely on almost exactly the same methodology, with the changes taking place in the realm of instruction. That way, the reassessment more authentically measures whether or not instruction improved student achievement, rather than just having a better match between assignments and the rubric.

**Question:** Can the LAC coaches be of any assistance as you refine your signature assignments?

SAC Response:

Our plan for this year is to reassess the Gen Ed Signature Assignments from last year, using the same process and tools as last year. The one change we will make is to disseminate some information to our SAC regarding which types of assignments and teaching seemed to score well on the Integrative Learning Rubric. Then, we will encourage instructors to update or revise their Signature Assignments based on what we learned last year. Although this slightly alters our process from last year's assessment, we feel that we still have a lot to learn about designing and implementing quality Signature Assignments and that this is an important area for growth for our SAC. Once we feel that we have consistent and quality assignments and processes in place, we can then continue to improve the teaching of the Signature Assignments, and, ultimately, the Integrative Learning outcome.

In terms of support, LAC coaches could be helpful in helping us improve inter-rater reliability, as mentioned in our LAC Assessment plan for 21-22.

## **SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES or OPPORTUNITIES**

4A. Is there anything further you would like to share about your program's achievements at this time?

We are very proud of what we have accomplished over the past four years. The pandemic has adversely affected numbers, especially in the traditional music track; but, many systems have been put in place and our reputation for excellence continues to grow throughout the region. Just prior to the start of the pandemic, the Rock Creek Chamber Choir was invited to compete in the Bali International Choral Festival and in the same year was selected to perform at the Oregon Music Educators Association conference. The group had also received invitations to perform on 89.9 All Classical and to collaborate with the Oregon Symphony. It is precisely these opportunities that attract students and increase a program's visibility. As we work to unify scheduling across campuses, prioritize ensembles and music theater productions and refine the curriculum, we believe we will rebuild the program and once again attract students at pre-pandemic rates.

4B. Are there any challenges not described above that you would like to note here?

In addition to the pandemic-related difficulties we have faced, there are certain things that we perceive could help us tremendously as we work to recruit and retain students. As compared to other community colleges and universities, PCC music faculty have no release time for recruitment and scholarly activities. Such release is critical if we are to recruit, as these things take time out of the work day. Realistically, faculty should be routinely visiting schools to clinic and promote the program, but without release time, this is virtually impossible. One way other institutions manage this is by crediting ensembles with a high course load. Although students only earn one credit for each of the ensembles, the amount of work that goes into a performing ensemble far outweighs the one credit of load the class provides. Collegiate ensembles are normally competing, collaborating, touring and performing large orchestral works, all of which require many hours of planning and logistics work. Similarly, there is often release time for directors of music theater productions, as this is also incredibly time consuming. By freeing up some of the faculty's time, we will undoubtedly be better able to recruit for the college at a time when enrollment is of great concern.

It should also be noted that as a result of the college reorganization, there is an increasing need to intercampus collaboration on things like scheduling, ensemble locations, course offerings, curriculum and faculty roles and responsibilities. All of this work will take time, but is of utmost importance if we are to emerge from the reorganization stronger than we were coming in. We sincerely hope the administration will support us in these endeavors on the understanding that with proper advocacy, administration and faculty governance, the PCC Music department can and will continue to grow. We firmly believe that given proper resources and support, the music department will continue to develop a reputation for excellence and attract students from throughout the region.

4C. Do you see any opportunities in the near or long term that you would like to share?

Over the past several years, we have worked hard to encourage and support transfer to four year institutions. Among the more successful transfer agreements has been that with Pacific University. With the closure of Marylhurst University, Pacific became the only accredited Music Therapy program in the state. Seeing great potential in that, we met and established an articulation agreement with that department that would allow students to transfer into the music therapy BA as juniors. Over the past four years, we have successfully assisted 8 students in obtaining scholarships (some full ride!) and being admitted as juniors into the music school. Since that time, additional four year colleges have reached out with interest in establishing similar articulation agreements. It is becoming apparent that as colleges face enrollment declines across the board, institutions will need to look for creative solutions to recruit and retain students and articulation agreements with private colleges is generally uncharted territory in Oregon. We hope that by making personal connections with all the colleges and universities throughout the region, we can build these agreements and, in so doing, encourage a greater number of students to complete their first 2-3 years at PCC.