

#### #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 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 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).* 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). **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 201 classes and the alternate ASL 201 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):* 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?

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 72% (N=4), while the on-campus class average was above 85% (N=4) in Fall 2017.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* While the scores for the on-campus ASL 201 final exam seem rather comparable to the Dual Credit ASL 201 classes, in reality the number of signs learned in the Dual Credit ASL 201 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 of the curriculum.

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 201 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 201 will achieve proficiency levels in ASL more similar to that attained by the Dual Credit ASL 201.

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