

2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/1/2022 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: Vicki Anderson, Margie Propp, Linda Bond, Sarah Sherbet, Nancy Lopez
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation;</i> b) <i>Student Outcome;</i> c) <i>Question(s);</i> e) <i>Methodology</i>
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? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).</i> 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> Can students relate a narrative in ASL with accurate vocabulary and grammar, and with a confident and appropriate performance ability so as to be comprehensible to the audience viewing them? Can they demonstrate an appropriate level of receptive and productive proficiency? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 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, 0% of students had a final interview score of 90% or more (N=7, 0 received an A). In the traditional setting, 42% of students obtained an exam score in the "A/A-" range (N=12; 5 received an A). In terms of overall average scores for each class, the traditional class yielded an average of 71%; the dual credit class yielded an average in the 88-89% range. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> At first glance, it appears that the traditional class students significantly outperformed the dual credit students (42% of traditional students received an A on the final narrative, compared to 0% of the dual credit students. However, a very high proportion of the dual credit students (6 out of 7, or 86%) received B+ range scores just below an A. Perhaps a more telling comparison of the two types of classes is the class average: For the traditional class, the average was only 71%, whereas it was 88%-89% for the dual credit class. Taking these two sets of statistics together, the analysis seems to show that the performance of both classes is really very similar....and that the dual credit classes may have been graded more rigorously. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> The number of students taking ASL 102 for dual credit is slightly higher than in other years, but not as high as in the traditional classroom. This may skew the comparison as well. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The analysis seems to show that student performance in the traditional and dual credit classes is roughly equivalent, even if not exactly equivalent.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6-19-2022 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Margie Propp, Linda Bond, Kim Davis, Sarah Sherbet, Nancy Lopez
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> It indicates that the current practices of the dual credit setting instructors are effective, so no changes are needed. 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> none
Submitted by: Vicki Anderson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/23/22

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 6/23/22

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na