

## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> HGISML <b>Date:</b> 7/30/2021 <b>Course(s):</b> ASL 201
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit                      Select                      Select
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Kim Davis, Sara Sherbert
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - 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 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). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (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.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 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. In the traditional setting, 2/2 students received a final score of 90% or higher on their final assessment. In the Dual Credit setting, 1/1 student received a final score of 90% or higher. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Since the percentage of scores that were above 90% was the same for both groups, it is assumed that the course outcomes were comparable. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) n/a 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021    How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) E-mail    Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? no changes needed 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - What is the anticipated impact of the <b>ACTION*</b> on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? n/a 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the <b>ACTION*</b> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). n/a
<b>Submitted by:</b> Vicki Anderson <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 8/9/21
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved 8/9/21
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na