

2023– 24 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 7/7/2024 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: Sarah Sherbert, Nancy Lopez, Vicki Anderson
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* - <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 would have been administered in which students were required to present a prepared presentation and answer questions about it posed by the instructor. This exam would have measured student accuracy in ASL vocabulary and grammar and fluency in performance skill level. The scores from the dual credit class would have been collected for comparison with scores from the traditional class. However, THIS YEAR THERE WERE ONLY DUAL CREDIT ASL 201 CLASSES, NO TRADITIONAL CLASSES ON CAMPUS. 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 would have equalled or surpassed the percentage of similar scores for the traditional class, then outcomes would have been considered to be comparable. However, THIS YEAR THERE WERE ONLY DUAL CREDIT ASL 201 CLASSES, NO TRADITIONAL CLASSES ON CAMPUS.
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> In the Dual Credit classes, 0/1 and 6/8 students received grades of 90% or higher as final grades for their courses. This is an overall average of 78% of students. However, THIS YEAR THERE WERE ONLY DUAL CREDIT ASL 201 CLASSES, NO TRADITIONAL CLASSES ON CAMPUS. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> No comparison possible this year between Dual Credit and traditional classes. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Instructors reported a lack of motivation among ASL 101 and 102 students, but it would appear that ASL 201 students showed more motivation, given the number who received a grade of 90% or higher for their course. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? No comparison possible this year
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 7/7/2024 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nancy Lopez, Sarah Sherbert, Margie Propp, Roxie Petersen, Crystal Pierce, Vicki Anderson
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> n/a (no traditional class held) 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): 8/13/24
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na