

2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Music Date: April 11, 2022 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: Herl, Kenney
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. Of 4 dual credit exams given, the median exam score was 84.6 percent, compared with a 20-year median of 86.4 percent for on-campus students. The median subscore for fundamentals (questions A–C) was 92.1; for analysis (question D) it was 89.7; and for part writing (questions E–H) it was 72.3. We do not have median subscores for on-campus students because we did not calculate them before the exams were shredded. We will try to do better next time. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Our goal was that there be no more than a 5.0-percentage point difference in the overall median scores between dual credit and on-campus students, and this is the case (the difference between the on-campus score of 86.4 and the dual credit score of 84.6 is 1.8 percent). We also wanted there to be no more than a 10-point difference in the median subscores in each of the three major sections of the exam. Although we cannot make this comparison because we do not have all the subscores, the dual-credit subscores seem reasonable to us; and we think it is highly unlikely, given the closeness of the overall median scores to each other, that the subscores differed by much. The result this year is much better than the previous result (from two years ago, as the dual credit course was not offered last year), when the dual credit median score was nearly 13 points lower than the on-campus median score. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) With so few students taking the dual credit exam, the median score can vary widely from year to year. This does not necessarily mean that the quality of instruction has changed, but could simply reflect the ability and work ethic of individual students in the course in a particular year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? There was a 1.8 percent difference in the median final exam scores of dual credit versus on-campus students, which is not a significant difference between the two modes of delivery.
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: April 11, 2022 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) by email Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, 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? What we did this year seemed to work well: (1) grading each exam ourselves and delivering to the dual credit instructor an explanation of each error; and (2) offering suggestions for teaching difficult concepts. We plan to do the same next year. 2. IMPACT* - What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? We hope that students will do at least as well next time. 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). none
Submitted by: Joseph Herl Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/14/22
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/14/22
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na