

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/26/2025 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: Margie Propp, John Reinke, 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 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. However, this year the Dual Credit instructors only reported final course grades (not final exam/project scores), and so for the purposes of this executive summary, final course grades will be used instead. 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (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.
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, 4/20 students received a score of 90% or above in the spring semester on the final signing exam; 16/20 received a final grade of 90% or above for the course. For the Dual Credit setting with 1 student, 1/1 student received a final grade of 90% or above (96%), while the other Dual Credit setting reported 13/17 students received a final grade of 90% or above. Because the Dual Credit setting reported final grades only, this report will use final grades as the point of comparison. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The proportion of students who received a 90% or above as a final grade was 80% in the traditional class, compared to 100% and 76% in the two Dual Credit settings, respectively. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> It is notable this year that students in the traditional class did relatively well overall for their final grades in the course (16/20 received final grades of 90% or above), yet only 4/20 received scores of 90% or above on their final signing project. This "mismatch" may be due to student attitudes towards the end of the course, or it may be due to what the instructor focuses on for grading purposes. (The final signing project is probably the most direct measure for the course of student language proficiency, so perhaps this shows that students are not as proficient at the end of the course as we would like to think.) This result is the inverse of last year's issues, when it was noted that many students did well on the final signing project in the traditional class, yet performed more poorly overall for the class show us as a department that students are not submitting assignments and are not taking course responsibilities as seriously as they need to in order to learn ASL well. This will need to be addressed with the instructors who will be teaching next term. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? In final grades, it is clear that the Dual Credit students performed roughly equivalently to students in the traditional class, with no differences that achieved statistical significance. (Traditional class percentage of students with final grades of 90% or better: 80% (16/20 students); Dual Credit class percentages of students with final grades of 90% or better: 100% (1/1 student), 76% (13/17 students).
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6/26/2025 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> John Reinke, Nancy Lopez, 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> Since the proportion of grades above 90% for each class indicates that the current practices of the Dual Credit setting instructors are similar to what is happening in the traditional

setting, no changes are needed in the alternative format setting. However, it would be a more useful for tracking overall student proficiency to compare final exam/project scores next year rather than simply final course grades. The ASL Program will request again (more strongly) of Dual Credit instructors to submit final exam/project scores as a measure of student proficiency, in addition to final course grades.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* n/a

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* n/a

Submitted by: Vicki Anderson **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/30/25

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na