

2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Music Date: May 24, 2023 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
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. To ensure consistency in grading, all the exams were graded by the course liaison (Herl) rather than by the instructor.
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. Three schools offered dual credit music theory this year, with a total of 12 students. The median score for Seward was 91.3, for DC1 was 73.8, and for DC2 was 85.9. We used to compare subscores from specific sections of the exam, but found that this was unnecessary for reliable comparisons, so we no longer do that. Instead, we determine which parts of the exam students at underperforming schools are having difficulty with and offer help to those schools to improve those areas. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Seward has taught the course for 3 years, and the median final exam scores have improved from 77.4% to 91.3%, which is well above our 20-year on-campus median of 86.4%. DC2 is teaching the course for the first time, and the median is already 85.9%, which is just below the on-campus median and well within the acceptable range (we want dual credit median scores to be no more than 5 points lower). DC1 is teaching the course for the second year. Last year's median from DC1 was 48.7%, and this year's median is 73.8%, so we have seen a large improvement, but the score is still more than 10 points under the on-campus median. In summary, students from Seward and DC1 can perform the tasks commonly expected of students, but those at DC1 cannot yet do so. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The dual credit classes are not large: 2 students at Seward, and 5 each at DC1 and DC2. This could skew the results. In addition, this is a course for college music majors and requires quite a bit of time and commitment. Students who do not plan to study music might not have the interest needed to do as well as future music majors. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? See the Interpretation section above.
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: May 24, 2023 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) By email. Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, 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? No change at Seward and DC2. We are working with DC1 on improving the course. Alternatively, we are offering to have them teach Music Appreciation instead, a course for nonmajors, which might be more appropriate for their student population. 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 the scores from DC1 will continue to improve next year. 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): 5/30/23
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 5/30/23
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na