

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Music Date: June 4, 2026 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) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Submitted in 2025 and has not changed. 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (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). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> We would like to find out whether the students can perform the tasks commonly expected of students completing first-semester music theory. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> One school offered dual credit music theory this year, with a total of 1 student. The student's final exam score was 84.0. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The 20-year on-campus median score is 86.4, and the dual credit student's score of 84.0 is statistically identical. This shows that our dual-credit student can perform the tasks expected of him as well as the average Concordia student. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. <i>interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low</i>) With such a small sample size, it is difficult to draw valid conclusions. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? See the Interpretation section above.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 4, 2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> By email. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Blersch, Cody, Grimpo, Herl, von Kampen.
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> No change is needed. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We would like to see similar results, or better, next year. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). none
Submitted by: Joseph Herl Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/16/26 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na