

2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/1/2022 Course(s): ASL 201
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 final project 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> 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). <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=6, 0 received an A). In the traditional setting, 100% of students obtained an exam score in the "A/A-" range (N=3; 3 received an A). 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 (100% of traditional students received an A or A- on the final project, compared to 0% of the dual credit students. However, a very high proportion of the dual credit students (5 out of 6, or 83%) received B+ range scores just below an A. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> There is significant reason to wonder if there is a difference in grading rigor between the traditional classroom instructor and the dual credit instructor, and that the students are really more comparable in the two classes than it might appear. 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. However, it would be wise to re-visit the common rubric to see if the instructors for the two types of classes are using the rubrics in a similar fashion. 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