

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/24/2026 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, Nathan Hynum, Nancy Lopez
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 we could have compared final assessment scores, we could have said that, 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. Since we only have final grades for this measure, we will consider the courses to be comparable if the percentage of students in the traditional and dual credit classes earning an A or A- in the course was roughly equivalent.
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, 3/4 students received a score of 90% or above in the spring semester as a final course grade. The Dual Credit settings that reported results indicated that 11/16 students and 9/12 students, respectively, 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 69% and 75%, respectively, in the Dual Credit settings. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Enrollment was lower this year than usual in the ASL 102 class (only 4 students). Nevertheless, the proportion of students who received an A- (90%) or higher in the course was still 75%, just like last year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The performance of the traditional and Dual Credit courses was approximately equal for ASL 102.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6/27/2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> e-mail <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Margie Propp, Kevin Miller, Crystal Pierce, Nathan Hynum, Nancy Lopez
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</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): 6/25/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/25/26
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na