

2019– 20 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Music Date: June 17, 2020 Course(s): Mu 103 (Music Theory I)
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Grimpo, Herl, von Kampen
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan 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). See 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). Similar final exams were given, with identical format and questions of comparable difficulty.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): We would like to find out whether the students can perform the tasks commonly expected of students completing first-semester music theory. 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The median final exam score of the 32 students in the on-campus course was 90.2 percent; the median of the 2 students in the dual-credit course was 77.4 percent. Of the individual sections of the exam, the median scores in theory fundamentals (questions A and B) and analysis (question D) differed by less than 10 percent between the two modes of delivery, while the scores in transposition (question C) and composition/harmonization (questions E, F, G, and H) differed by more than 10 percent. 3). INTERPRETATION * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). In order to continue on to the next semester of music theory, our students need to achieve at least a C (73.3 percent) in Music 103. The dual-credit exam scores of 77.0 and 77.7 suggest that the students are competent, but only barely so. We are not so concerned about the transposition question, because the poor showing there appears to result from the students' failure to memorize the relevant instrumental transpositions rather than from a lack of understanding. That is easy enough to correct. The problems in composition and harmonization, though, seem to be due to the instructor not recognizing certain errors, which probably means that students were not taught how to avoid them. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) n/a 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Because there was more than a 10-percent difference in the scores of five questions and a nearly 13-point difference in the overall scores, the outcomes of the on-campus and dual-credit courses are not similar; and the dual-credit students cannot yet perform the tasks commonly expected as well as the on-campus students.
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: June 17, 2020 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) In a regular department meeting. Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz, 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? (1) We have delivered to the dual credit instructor the marked exams with an explanation of each error. (2) We have also delivered a "cheat sheet" of part-writing errors that the instructor can use in marking homework and exams when the course is taught again. (3) We will have the instructor send copies of completed unit exams to us for evaluation, not just the final exam. (4) We will offer to check students' homework whenever the instructor would like. 2. IMPACT *- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION * on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? We would like to see the median final exam score differ by no more than 5 points between the two modes of delivery. 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 by: Joseph Herl Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/15/2020
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 7/15/2020
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

