

2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 7/30/2021 Course(s): ASL 102
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: Sara Sherbert, Vicki Anderson, Carol Manning
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> 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 presentation and answer questions about it posed by the instructor. 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 – <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). If the percentage of student scores on the final assessment of 90% (A-) and above for the dual credit class equalled or surpassed the percentage of similar scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to use ASL in a sufficiently proficient manner in order to relate simple narratives 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). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> In the traditional setting, 19/19 students received a score of 90% or above for the class; however, this was due in part to problems the instructor had with Blackboard, and it is not clear that she intended for every student to receive such a high score for the class. In the Dual Credit class, 1 out of 2 students received a score higher than 90% in the final assessment and in the class. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Unfortunately these results do not clearly show if there was comparability between the traditional and Dual Credit ASL 102 classes. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The issues of the traditional setting instructor (a new adjunct) with using Blackboard and the Blackboard gradebook makes it difficult to know how students really performed in the traditional setting. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? On the surface, it would appear that the traditional setting class performed much better, but it is not really possible to make that assertion given the circumstances.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> not shared due to issues with the data <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> n/a <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> n/a
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> The adjuncts for the traditional setting need more training in using Blackboard and Blackboard tools for assessment....before final grades are due. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> n/a 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> n/a
Submitted by: Vicki Anderson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 8/9/21
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 8/9 21 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na