

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6/24/2026 Course(s): ASL 202
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: 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 would have been administered in which students were required to present a prepared presentation and answer questions about it posed by the instructor. This exam would have 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 THERE WERE ONLY ONE DUAL CREDIT ASL 202 CLASS, WITH NO TRADITIONAL CLASS ON CAMPUS. 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 THERE WERE ONLY DUAL CREDIT ASL 201 CLASSES, NO TRADITIONAL CLASSES ON CAMPUS.
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 Dual Credit class, 1/2 students received a grade of 90% (A-) or higher as a final grade for their course. However, THIS YEAR THERE WERE ONLY DUAL CREDIT ASL 202 CLASSES, NO TRADITIONAL CLASSES ON CAMPUS. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> In the Dual Credit class, 50% of the students received a final grade of 90% (A-) or higher for the course. 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 lack of a traditional ASL 202 class makes a comparison between Dual Credit and traditional student performance impossible for this year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? No comparison, since THIS YEAR THERE WERE ONLY STUDENTS IN ONE DUAL CREDIT ASL 202 CLASS, NO TRADITIONAL CLASS ON CAMPUS.
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> Nancy Lopez, Toria Richardson
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> There is no plan to change anything about the Dual Credit course. It is hoped that student interest will result in enough enrollment to run a traditional ASL 202 class next year on campus. 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