

#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 8-18-2017

Course(s): ASL 101

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 analysis of artifacts:

See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes 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). In both the traditional ASL class setting and the dual credit ASL class setting, a similar exam was administered in which students were required to present a prepared narrative and answer questions about it posed by the instructor. We administered a common exam in the traditional setting and the dual credit high school settings. This exam measured student accuracy in ASL vocabulary and grammar and fluency in performance skill level. The scores from the dual credit class were collected for comparison with scores from the traditional class

2). **COMPARABILITY** – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). If the range of scores of the dual credit class equalled or surpassed the range of scores of the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students relate a narrative in ASL with accurate vocabulary and grammar, and with a confident and appropriate performance ability so as to be comprehensible to the audience viewing them?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. We compared scores from the traditional setting and the dual credit high school setting and determined that the scores from the dual credit settings are indeed similar to or higher than those from the traditional setting. The dual credit setting had a range of scores from 78% to 100%, with a mean of 90.5%, with 2/3 of the grades in the "A" range of 90% or higher (N=3 students). In the traditional setting, more than 3/4 of the students obtained an exam score in the "A" range (N=36 students), with a mean score above 90%.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Taking into consideration the small number of students in the dual credit class and how that impacted the range of test scores for that class, the range of scores and mean scores for both types of classes were considered to be roughly equivalent. In other words, the results indicated that for ASL 101 classes, students achieved the same mastery of the material, whether they were in a traditional class or a dual credit class.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) Next year there needs to be specific attention paid to calibration of scorer results between the dual credit teacher and the traditional setting instructors. There is not reason to believe that these skew

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The results indicated that, for the specific items examined, the outcomes for the students in the dual credit high schools exceeded the outcomes for the traditional setting students, with the exception of the one outlier class indicated above.**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 8-29-2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) in an e-mail to members of the departmentJ

Who were results shared with? (List names): Vicki Anderson, Julie Johnston, Jerry Pfabe, John Mehl, Matt Myers, Amy Royuk, Melissa Mann, Peggy Williams, Kim Davis, Ben Sparks, Margie Propp, PeiLan Kao

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?* It indicates that the current practices of the dual credit setting instructors is effective, so no changes are needed.

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).* none

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Vicki Anderson

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 8/29/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 8/29/17