#4. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages   **Date:** 6-15-18   **Course(s):** ASL 102

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:** Kayla Spand, Ben Sparks, Margie Propp, Kim Davis

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). When the mean scores of the on-campus ASL 102 classes and the alternate ASL 102 class are compared, the mean score for each alternative delivery class will equal or exceed the mean score for the on-campus class.

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. The Dual Credit class average for the ASL 102 final exam was 76% (N=7), while the on-campus class average was above 85% (N=4) in Fall 2017 and 80% (N=11) in Spring 2018.

3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). While the scores for the on-campus ASL 102 final exam seem rather comparable to the Dual Credit ASL 102 classes, in reality the number of signs learned in the Dual Credit ASL 102 class is almost twice that learned in the on-campus class. In that regard, the on-campus and Dual Credit classes are not entirely equivalent, and this is a scenario we are working to remedy next year by increasing the rigor fof the curriculum in the on-campus class.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)

5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?*** The scores for the on-campus class seem relatively comparable to those of the Dual Credit class, but--as stated above--this fact alone is deceptive, since the students in the Dual Credit class actually evidence a more advanced proficiency level. (i.e., they know more signs and more grammar).

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 6-15-18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail to ASL adjuncts and Dual Credit teacher

Who were results shared with? (List names): Kayla Spand, Margie Propp, Ben Sparks, Kim Davis

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?*   The alternative format teaching will not change in the

coming year, but the on-campus curriculum will change to increase the rigor of the ASL 102 class to better match the Dual Credit class scope and sequence. Once the curriculum has been redesigned, we also need to create a new assessment that will take into account the higher vocabulary level of the on-campus students (compared to this year's on-campus students).

*2. **IMPACT****- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION**** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*   Students in the on-campus ASL 102 will achieve proficiency levels in ASL more similar to that attained by the Dual Credit ASL 102.

*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): 7/3/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/18