

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Music Date: June 15, 2025 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 8 students. The median score for School 1 was 87.7, for School 2 was 89.8, and for School 3 was 87.5. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). All three schools have offered this course in previous years. This is the fourth year for School 2. The first year its median score was 48.7, the second year 78.8, the third year 82.2, and this year it is 89.8, which is the highest of any school—a huge improvement. The 20-year on-campus median score is 86.4, and all three schools have median scores that are better (if only slightly) than the on-campus median score. This shows that average students from all the dual-credit schools can perform the tasks expected of them. 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: School 1 had 1 student; School 2 had 2, and School 3 had 5. 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: June 15, 2025 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) By email. Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Cody, Grimpso, 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 is needed. 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 similar results, or better, 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): 6/16/25
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na