

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

Course: Mu 111 Alternative Format: Other Explain "Other" if selected: Dual Credit Department: Music Date: June 1, 2016
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) <i>Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> 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 – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared).</i> The mean and median exam scores of each class were calculated.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students understand and identify the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The Music Appreciation course taught at DC1 had an enrollment of three students each semester. In the fall semester, the mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 34 and the median was 33. In the spring semester, the mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 31 and the median was 31. The Music Appreciation course taught at Concordia University, Nebraska, had an enrollment of 35 students. The mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 28 and the median was 29. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The median scores of the multiple choice cumulative exam in the dual credit and traditional courses are 70% (C) or better. This demonstrates that the students are indeed understanding and remembering the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Since each class size varied, the median exam scores also varied. This was to be expected. The smaller (dual credit) courses had fairly high (B to C+) exam averages. The larger (traditional general education) course had a more moderate exam average (mid to low C) as the score distribution followed a typical bell curve. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). 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: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 15, 2016 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> von Kampen, Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> The high school students in the dual credit Music Appreciation course are, on average, performing slightly better than the college students in the

traditional general education Music Appreciation course. Therefore, no change to the dual credit 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: June 15, 2016

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/24/16

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/24/16