## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Kim Davis, Sar Sherbert         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* - 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 i 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 th traditional class.         2). COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode 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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.         Summary of RESULTS*:       1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Are students able to use ASL in a sufficient 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 of the instructor?         2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. In the traditional setting, 1/1 student received a final score of 90%	Alternative Format(5)	– select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
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* - 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 i 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 – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode 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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable. 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 prese and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. In the traditional setting, 1/1 student received a final score of 90% or higher. 3). INTERPRETATION* - 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 scorin		
<ul> <li>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</li> <li>Analysis of artifacts:</li> <li>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 presentation and answer questions about i posed by the instructor. This exam measured student accuracy in ASL vocabulary and grammar and fluency in poerformance skill level. The scores from the dual credit class were collected for comparison with scores from the raditional class.</li> <li>2). COMPARABLITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). If the percentage of student scores on the inal assessment of 90% (A-) and above for the dual credit class equalled or surpassed the percentage of simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.</li> <li>Summary of RESULTS*:</li> <li>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 prese and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Since the percentage of some scores that were above 90% was the same for both groups, it is assumed that the course outcomes were comparable.&lt;</li></ul>	Sherbert	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: <i>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</i> * - 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 i 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 th traditional class. 2). COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode 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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable. 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 prese and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are <i>encouraged but optional</i> . 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). INTERPRETATION* - 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 to was low) n'a	See Alternative Delive	ry Assessment Plan for:
<ol> <li>Student Outcome: <i>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</i> - 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 i obserd by the instructor. This exam measured student accuracy in ASL vocabulary and grammar and fluency in berformance skill level. The scores from the dual credit class were collected for comparison with scores from the traditional class.</li> <li>COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode 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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.</li> <li>Summary of RESULTS*:</li> <li><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 make simple presentations that they have had time to prepare to prese and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor?</li> <li><i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 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 bigher.</li> <li><i>INTERPRETATION* - Discus how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Since the percentage or score stat were above 90% was the same for both groups, it is assumed that the course outcomes were comparable.</li> <li><i>Summarize the assession of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</i> The student outcom</li></ol>		
<ul> <li>Lused). 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 i 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.</li> <li>2). COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery mode 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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.</li> <li>Summary of RESULTS*:</li> <li>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 of the instructor?</li> <li>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 on their dinal assessment question shot the assessment question(s). Since the percentage of some scores stores that were above 90% was the same for both groups, it is assumed that the course outcomes were comparable.</li> <li>4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Th</li></ul>	Analysis of artifacts:	
<ul> <li>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 simila scores for the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.</li> <li>Summary of RESULTS*: <ol> <li>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 prese and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Since the percentage or scores that were above 90% was the same for both groups, it is assumed that the course outcomes were comparable.</li> <li>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.</li> </ol></li></ul> Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of ResultsSummarize your conclusions including: <ol> <li>ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this</li> </ol>	<i>used).</i> In both the tradit administered in which s posed by the instructor. performance skill level. traditional class.	ional ASL class setting and the dual credit ASL class setting, a similar exam was tudents were required to present a prepared presentation and answer questions about it This exam measured student accuracy in ASL vocabulary and grammar and fluency in The scores from the dual credit class were collected for comparison with scores from the
<ol> <li>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 of the instructor?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>INTERPRETATION* - 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.</li> <li>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.</li> <li>Mon were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</li> <li>ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this</li> </ol>	were comparable? (not final assessment of 90%	e "na" if delivery modes were not compared). If the percentage of student scores on the % (A-) and above for the dual credit class equalled or surpassed the percentage of similar
<ul> <li>sufficiently proficient manner in order to make simple presentations that they have had time to prepare to preserve and then to respond with sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience of the instructor?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>3). INTERPRETATION* - 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.</li> <li>4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.</li> <li>Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp</li> <li>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</li> <li>1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>3). INTERPRETATION* - 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.</li> <li>4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.</li> <li>Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</li> <li>1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this</li> </ul>	1). Restate the assessr sufficiently proficient ma and then to respond wit the instructor?	ment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Are students able to use ASL in a anner in order to make simple presentations that they have had time to prepare to present h sufficient proficiency to questions posed to them about the narrative by the audience or
<ul> <li>4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring to was low) n/a</li> <li>5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable.</li> <li>Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</li> <li>1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this</li> </ul>	encouraged but optionation final assessment. In the 3). INTERPRETATION scores that were above	al. In the traditional setting, 2/2 students received a final score of 90% or higher on their e Dual Credit setting, 1/1 student received a final score of 90% or higher. * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Since the percentage of
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student outcomes for the two formats were comparable. Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 7/30/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this	4). Observations made	that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring too
department) E-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this	outcomes for the two fo	rmats were comparable.
1. ACTION*- How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this	department) E-mail V	Who were results shared with? (List names): Sara Sherbert, Kim Davis, Margie Propp
	1. ACTION*- How will v	what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this
2. IMPACT*- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? n/a	the next academic year	? n/a
3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of th ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). n/a	ACTION* (i.e. an addition	onal staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). n/a
Submitted by: Vicki Anderson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 8/9/21	Submitted by: Vicki Ar	
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 8/9/21 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na		proval/additional action needed. Approved 8/9/21