

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/26/2025 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: Margie Propp, Nancy Lopez, 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 are (ideally) 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 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> In the traditional setting, 9/12 students received a score of 90% or above in the spring semester as a final course grade (9/12 received scores of 90% or more on the final exam/project). The Dual Credit setting that reported results for final project indicated that 5/11 students received a final course grade 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 as a final course grade was 75% in the traditional class, compared to 45% in the Dual Credit setting. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> These results are unusual--usually the Dual Credit students are comparable to or outperform the traditional setting students (mostly because Dual Credit settings take two semesters, rather than one, for a course--but not this year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? This year the students in the traditional setting outperformed the Dual Credit 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> Margie Propp, Cystal Pierce, Nancy Lopez, 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> Until there is a discussion of why the Dual Credit students in this class performed so much less strongly than students in the traditional setting, there will be no changes in teaching. If it is determined that changes in scope and sequence or other instruction-based items are needed to make the outcome of the two courses more comparable--in other words, if there are not other reasons behind this year's lower Dual Credit performance, like student motivation (noted in last year's report)--then changes will be designed and implemented 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> The impact will be more on the teacher instructional design side, as the teachers determine where the traditional classroom and Dual Credit setting classrooms match or don't match. This discussion should serve to either enhance student achievement or to help counter challenges behind the anomalies seen here. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the</i>

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