

#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Music	Date: May 17, 2017	Course(s): Mu 111 - Music Appreciation			
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:					
Dual Credit	Select	Select	Select	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts:					
Elizabeth Grimpo, Jerrode Marsh, Joseph Herl, Kurt von Kampen					
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology					
Analysis of artifacts:					
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). The 40 question multiple choice cumulative exam, taken by every student, was graded according to the attached answer key. A summary of scores, according to each course, is also attached.					
2). COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). The mean and median exam scores of each class were calculated.					
Summary of RESULTS*:					
1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students understand and identify the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music?					
2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The Music Appreciation course taught as a Dual Credit course at St. Paul Lutheran High School in Concordia, MO, had an enrollment of three students in the fall semester. It was not offered in the spring semester due to low student interest. The results of the multiple choice cumulative exam are as follows: mean = 34; median = 35; mode = N/A.					
The Music Appreciation course taught as a General Education course in traditional face-to-face format, and which was offered only during the spring semester at Concordia University, Nebraska, had an enrollment of 33 students. The results of the multiple choice cumulative exam are as follows: mean = 32; median = 33; mode = 34.					
3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The mean scores of the multiple choice cumulative exam in both the dual credit and traditional courses are 80% (B) or better. This demonstrates that the students in both courses are indeed able to understand and identify a substantial amount of the broad themes and supporting details within the history of western classical music.					
4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) This year, the results in the traditional course were significantly higher than last year. This is most likely due to the time the exam was administered. Last year, it was given at the end a regular class period during the last week of classes. The students knew it wouldn't count toward their overall course grade. Consequently, most of them rushed through it, and it didn't seem like many did their best. This year, the exam was administered during the final exam time. Students knew it would count toward their overall course grade. Consequently, they took their time to read each question thoroughly before answering. As a result, the scores were significantly higher than those of the previous year and are probably a more accurate reflection of the students' knowledge and understanding.					
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The assessment results were similar, indicating that the average student in the dual credit and					

traditional format are learning and understanding the same material

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: May 17, 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) This executive summary, the assessment tool, and supporting assessment results were shared via email with the full-time members of the music department.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Jeffrey Blersch, Elizabeth Grimpo, Joseph Herl, Nicole Jacobs, Andrew Schultz, Kurt von Kampen

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The high school students in the Dual Credit course and the college students in the traditional General Education course performed roughly the same on the multiple choice cumulative exam, indicating that all students, regardless of course delivery, are learning and understanding the same material to the same degree. Therefore, no change to the course instruction is needed at this time.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* N/A

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). N/A

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: May 17, 2017

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 5/19/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/19/17