

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/24/2026 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: Kevin Miller, John Reinke, Nancy Lopez, Nathan Rynum, 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. 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, 18/21 received a final grade of 90% or above for the course in the spring semester. For the three Dual Credit settings, there were 26 students, 14 students, and 6 students respectively; in the setting with 26 students, 24/26 students received a final grade of 90% or above, while the Dual Credit setting with 14 students reported that 9/14 received a final grade of 90% or above, and the setting with 6 students reported that 5/6 students received a 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 86% in the traditional class, compared to 92%, 64%, and 83% in the three 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> 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: 86% (18/21 students); Dual Credit class percentages of students with final grades of 90% or better: 92% (24/26 students), 64% (9/14 students), and 83% (5/6 students).
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/27/2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Kevin Miller, Margie Propp, Crystal Pierce, Nancy Lopez, John Reinke, Nathan Hynum
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* - <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):** 6/25/26

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/25/26

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na