

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/24/2026 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: Toria Richardson, Vicki Anderson, 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 would have been collected for comparison with scores from the traditional class. However, this year the Dual Credit instructor only reported final grades, and so final grades will be used for comparison between the traditional and Dual Credit classes this year. 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 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 the comparison will be between final grades in the traditional and Dual Credit classes.
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 traditional class, 1/2 students received grades of 90% (A-) or higher as a final grade in the class. In the Dual Credit class, 4/7 students received grades of 90% (A-) or higher as final grades for their course. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The proportion of students who received a 90% (A-) or above as a final course grade was 50% in the traditional class, compared to 75% 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> The low number of students enrolled in the traditional ASL 201 course makes meaningful comparisons to the Dual Credit class setting impossible this year. Based on results from other years, this year's underperformance of the traditional setting students will be considered an anomaly. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The most straightforward comparison of these results shows that the Dual Credit students outperformed the traditional setting students this year for ASL 201.
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> Toria Richardson, 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> Although the proportion of grades above 90% (A-) for the Dual Credit versus traditional classes are not similar, this is not assumed to mean that changes are needed in the alternative format setting, so no changes will be suggested in the teaching. 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