

2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/15/2023 Course(s): ASL 101
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: Nancy Lopez, Roxanne Petersen, Vicki Anderson
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 execute a narrative presentation 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? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> In the traditional setting, 10/17 students received a score of 90% or above in the spring semester. (Data collection was incomplete for Fall 2022 due to an instructor leaving Concordia.) The Dual Credit setting that reported results of 5/9 students receiving a score of 90% or above. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The proportion of students who received a 90% or above on the final assessment was 59% in the traditional class, compared to 56% in the Dual Credit setting. These results are comparable. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> This year there was a difficulty in getting all instructors to report results. This will have to be addressed more directly next year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? 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..
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/16/2023 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Roxanne Petersen, Margie Propp, Nancy Lopez, Sara Sherbert
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 is similar to what is happening in the traditional setting , 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> n/a
Submitted by: Vicki Anderson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/27/23
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 6/27/23
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na