

## 2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> HGISML <b>Date:</b> 6/1/2022 <b>Course(s):</b> ASL 101
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit <b>Select</b> <b>Select</b>
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Vicki Anderson, Margie Propp, Linda Bond, Sarah Sherbet, Nancy Lopez
<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 relate simple narratives that they have had time to prepare to present? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. We compared scores from the traditional setting and the dual credit high school setting and determined that the score from the dual credit setting was similar to those from the traditional setting. In the dual credit setting, 36% of students had a final interview score of 90% or more (N=11, 4 received an A). In the traditional setting, 39% of students obtained an exam score in the "A/A-" range (N=18; 7 received an A. In terms of overall average scores for each class, the traditional class yielded an average of 84%; the dual credit class yielded an average in the 85%-88% range. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The percentage of students receiving A's as final interview scores for both types of classes were roughly equivalent. In addition, average scores for the whole class were similar between the traditional and dual credit sections. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The percentage of A's received in both dual credit and traditional classes were much lower than previous years; in previous years, 90% or more of the students received an A in both dual credit and traditional settings. The instructors are the same and the curriculum has not changed....It raises the question of whether the instructors are grading more rigorously, or if there is something going on with student motivation or application to study that is causing the severe dip in scores. Could this be related in some way to the outcomes of COVID on students' attitudes and performance? 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The results indicated that the outcomes for the students in the dual credit high school ASL 101 were approximately equivalent to those of the traditional ASL 101 classes.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail Who were results shared with? (List names): Margie Propp, Linda Bond, Kim Davis, Sarah Sherbet, Nancy Lopez
<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? It indicates that the current practices of the dual credit setting instructors is effective, so no changes are 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). none
<b>Submitted by:</b> Vicki Anderson <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/23/22
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved - 6/23/22
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na