## 2024–25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Music <b>Date:</b> June, 2025 <b>Course(s):</b> MU 111 <b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Du</b>		Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involv	ed with analysis of artifa	acts: Elizabeth
Grimpo, Jerrode Marsh, Kurt von Kampen		
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:		
a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Quest	tion(s); e) Methodology	
Analysis of artifacts:		
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - How was a	lata analyzed? (attach rub	rics/scoring tools if
used). A 25 question cumulative multiple choice exam was taken	by every student (fall sen	nester course, spring
semester course, and dual credit course) and graded according t	o the attached rubric.	
<ol><li>COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of</li></ol>		
were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compare	ed). The mean and mediar	n exam scored of each
class were calculated.		
Summary of RESULTS*:		
1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment pla	,	and and identify the
broad themes and supporting details within the history of western		
2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is re		
encouraged but optional. The Music Appreciation course taught a		-
an enrollment of three students. However, only one of them took	it for dual credit. The res	ults of the cumulative
multiple choice exam are as follows: mean = 22; median = 22.		
The Music Appreciation course taught as a General Education co	ourse in the traditional fac	a to faco format
offered in both the fall and spring semesters at Concordia University		
students, respectively. The results of the cumulative multiple cho		
(spring); median = 19 (fall), 19 (spring).	nce exam are as follows.	1100 $-21$ ( $100$ ), $22$
3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the as	sessment question(s). Th	e mean and median
scores of the multiple choice cumulative exam in both the dual cr		
average) or better. This demonstrates that the students in both c		
dentify a substantial amount of the broad themes and supporting		
nusic.	······	

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) None

5). *How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?* The outcomes of both instructional formats were consistent with each other. It is clear that students understood the course material regardless of the delivery.

Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: June, 2025How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a<br/>department) emailWho were results shared with? (List names):Kurt von Kampen, Joseph Herl, Jerrode<br/>Marsh

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 changes

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). Because this is a popular music General Education course at Concordia University, Nebraska, and because overall undergraduate enrollment is growing, we will be adding a second section of the course in both the fall and spring semesters.

Submitted by: Elizabeth GrimpoAssessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/25Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: naBUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na