

#3. Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery - Student Outcomes

To be completed by course instructors or program directors for 3 credit courses that are offered in **BOTH** the traditional (15 week face-to-face) format and in an alternative format (dual credit, online, and condensed time formats). Submit via email to the Assessment Committee Chair.

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 8-31-2016

Course(s): ASL 201

Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:

Dual Credit

Select

Select

Select

Select

Select

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Vicki Anderson, Ben Sparks, Peggy Williams, Margie Propp, Kim Davis, Kayla Nimigan

Course Requirements:

1. Each alternative delivery course meets credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).
 - a. **Attach: Credit Hour Audit - traditional format**
 - b. **Attach: Credit Hour Audit for each alternative format.** (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor).
2. Course requirements for all formats are comparable.
 - a. **Attach: Course Guide - traditional format.**
 - b. **Attach: Course Guide for each alternative format.** (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor).

Student Outcome:

1. *What student outcome will be assessed? student ability to make a presentation in ASL with a sufficient level of accuracy and performance ability so as to be comprehensible to the audience and to respond to questions about the presentation provided to them by the audience or the instructor*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something].** Students should be able to make a presentation in ASL with accurate vocabulary and grammar, and with a confident an appropriate performance ability so as to be comprehensible to the audience viewing them; students should be able to respond with accuracy and fluency to questions about their presentations posed to them by the audience or the instructor.

Question: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are students able to use ASL in a sufficiently proficient manner in order to make simple presentations that they have had time to prepare to present, and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience or the instructor?

Methodology

1. **Student Outcome - OBJECT***
 - a. *What student artifact from the **traditional course** will be used to assess the outcome?* final scores from the presentation-plus-question portion of the ASL 201 exam, performed in front of the class
 - i. *How will the artifact be collected?* The instructors will compile scores from the presentation-plus-question portion of the ASL 201 final exam.
 - b. *What student artifact from the **alternative course(s)** will be used to assess the outcome?* final scores from the presentation-plus-question portion of the ASL 201 exam, performed for an audience
 - i. *How will the artifact be collected?* Each instructor will compile scores from the presentation-plus-question portion of the ASL 201 final exam.

Analysis of Artifacts:

1) **Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA***

- a. *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*
 - i. Traditional course: Compiled scores for the presentation-plus-question portion of the

final exam will be analyzed and a mean score for the class (percentage) will be determined.

ii. Alternative course(s) (note SAME if the same as the traditional course): SAME

2) **COMPARABILITY** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (For example – there will not be a statistically significant difference among the mean final exam scores).

When the mean scores of the on-campus ASL 201 class and the alternate ASL 201 classes are compared, the mean score for each alternate class will equal or exceed the mean score for the on-campus class.

Submitted by: Vicki Anderson

Date: 8-31-2016

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/1/16

Submitter notified/additional action: na

Submitter notified of approval: 9/1/16