Template
Program: ASL/Deaf Studies: Major & Minor
Department EDS
Number of students enrolled in the program in Fall, 2011
Major: 84        Minor: 32
[ASL 1 & 2 Participants: 400-500 per Semester]

Faculty member completing template: Ostertag/Vicars 1/18/12

Period of reference in the template: 2006-07 to present

1. Please describe your program’s learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

The Deaf Studies program has always maintained an organizational culture regarding the importance of establishing learning outcomes and developing the capacity to assess progress toward the achievement of those outcomes. This has not been a transformation nor did it "become noticeable" in any particular year. Rather it has been ongoing from the inception of the Deaf Studies major.

Every one of the faculty believe and agree that it is beneficial and important to establish learning outcomes. Agreeing, believing, and having an organizational culture are not our challenges. Our challenges regarding tracking of outcomes and student progress are not cultural. Our challenges are structural and logistical. Seventy-five percent of our faculty (8 out of 12) are adjunct faculty. Of the adjunct faculty eighty-seven percent (7 out of 8) have "other jobs." In the spring of 2010 an attempt to arrange a faculty retreat with a "high percentage" of attendees required approximately 30 hours of coordination time. (Note: that figure is a conservative estimate and only includes the time of the coordinator and not the time of others assisting in coordination of that meeting). This is not an isolated experience. It is the norm. For example in the spring of 2012, after considerable coordination effort, only 3 attendees out of 12 made the effort and/or arranged their schedules in such a way as to be able to attend all of a "one-afternoon" faculty retreat at which the Department chair presented important information. (A few others managed to make it to "some" of the meeting.)

It is a challenge to "get together" to discuss processes and outcomes when 3/4ths of your faculty are at their "day jobs."

In focusing on the approaches that can be directly influenced, the next achievable step is to arrange teacher schedules in such a way as to allow for the maximum number of participants at faculty meetings wherein we can share information regarding outcomes and necessary adjustments. This scheduling has been implemented for Spring of 2012 (with results yet to be determined). Additionally we have established a faculty listserv to improve dissemination of information amongst the faculty (including information regarding desired outcomes). Over the past two years the Department has also made wonderful progress on creating a highly effective web site, complete with information and forms that will better enable us to be organized and track student progress.

The College of Education has been engaged in an extensive program of restructuring over the last 2.5 years. At the center of this is the streamlining of many of our administrative functions including our approach to assessment. In 2008, we began
exploring opportunities to centralize our college efforts and collecting data for assessment of learning goals around a central vision of TEACHing for change, which includes Transformation, Equity and Social Justice, Advocacy, Collaboration, Civic and Community Engagement and Human Capital and Diversity. This overarching vision of students and credential candidates in the College of Education is adopted by all programs. As many of our programs also must adhere to strict regulations of accrediting bodies, these standards are also aimed to integrate within the central assessment system. The college a College of Education has begun work toward hiring a director of assessment within the college to oversee the collection, analysis, and synthesis of assessment data for all programs, integrating with CMS and CTQ data.

2. Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes (“takeaways” concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content knowledge, skill sets, confidence levels) for students completing the program. For each stated outcome, please provide the reason that it was designated as desired by the faculty associated with the program.

[Please limit your response per outcome to 300 words or less]

[No priority order]

a) Ability to communicate on an academic level with ASL
b) Ability to share personal narratives about incidents and events through ASL
c) Demonstrate high intermediate proficiency in ASL
d) Demonstrate competence in ASL classifiers

The reasons these (and other) program outcomes were designated are the same: Through a series of meetings with the community, campus and area group faculty, program outcomes were devised per the input of the participants based upon academic rigor, research findings, and best practices from other nationwide colleges that offer said majors/minors (e.g., Gallaudet University, CSUN).

3. For undergraduate programs only, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible.

[Please limit your response to 400 words or less]

The ASL/Deaf Studies Bachelor’s degree and Minor programs are relatively new entities at Sac State. Hence, there are not many graduates as of yet. Essentially, fall terms see one to three graduating majors and minors with a larger number, 20-30, graduating in spring semesters. It is expected that these graduations will increase in the near future.

American Sign Language/Deaf Studies takes an interdisciplinary approach to the study of Deaf and hard-of-hearing people in American and world society. The program promotes the understanding of Deaf people as a linguistic and cultural group and encourages students to analyze existing stereotypes and policies relating to Deaf and hard-of-hearing people in order to work both within their own communities and others in affecting change for the betterment of the Deaf and hard-of-hearing community.
The B.A. program consists of a 41 – 48 Unit sequence of courses designed to provide a foundation for entry-level work within the Deaf community. The program is designed to be completed within 1 ½ to 2 years, if students enter the program during the Fall semester. Coursework consists of skills-based, lecture/discussion, theoretical seminars and a final Service Learning capstone course. While most courses are in the traditional classroom mode, some classes are hybrid/online learning within their offerings.

With an ASL/Deaf Studies Minor (a 23-unit sequence), students may obtain entry-level jobs in settings working with the Deaf such as residential supervisor, classroom aide, vocational trainer, and similar positions. Students may also combine an ASL/Deaf Studies minor with a related Major field of study such as Education, Counseling, Audiology and Speech Therapy for a more well-rounded grounding in the issues relating to the Deaf and hard-of-hearing in their field. Students in fields which are not specifically Deaf-related such as nursing, law, computer engineering, and many more may also experience an edge in gaining employment, whether in Deaf-related settings or not, with a minor in ASL/Deaf Studies compared to those without similar course work or experience.

As identified in the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals, these above ASL/Deaf Studies outcomes directly meet the Competence in the Disciplines and also address the Personal and Social Responsibility goals per the Deaf community.

4. For each desired outcome indicated in the item above, please:
   a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured. The below table summarizes the key assessment of outcomes and methodology used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)</th>
<th>When administered</th>
<th>Details about Administration</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades Earned: ASL 3 (EDS 153)</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>At end of semester</td>
<td>Individual faculty assess student work based on learning outcomes for specific ASL level.</td>
<td>To share information about self and others regarding: -biographical information -situations and problems - travel and vacation plans -develop competence in ASL classifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades Earned: ASL 4 (EDS 154)</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>At end of semester</td>
<td>Individual faculty assess student work based on learning outcomes for specific ASL level.</td>
<td>To be able to share information at an academic level in ASL. For example: To be able to formulate and express rules for activities and behaviors in ASL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades Earned: ASL 5 (EDS 155)</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>At end of semester</td>
<td>Individual faculty assess student work based on learning outcomes for specific ASL level.</td>
<td>To be able to share personal narratives about incidents and events. To be able to retell a short story in ASL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected:

The data is collected each semester from all students taking ASL 3, 4, and 5.

c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program.

See "Appendix A"
The attached instrument is an example of type of rubric used by language instructors to evaluate spoken (or in our case, "signed") language proficiency. It is similar in nature to the types of rubrics used by organizations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome.

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less per learning outcome]

Each of the sample learning outcomes is directly related to expressive sign language proficiency (which is analogous to "spoken language proficiency" and thus the analysis and evaluation process is similar for each of the sample learning outcomes. Each faculty member who teaches the selected courses video records his or her students demonstrating a signed story. The instructors then analyze and evaluate these recordings based on a rubric which considers the fluency, vocabulary, structure, comprehensibility, and grammatical features of the language sample.
5. Regarding each outcome and method discussed in items 2 and 4 above, please provide examples of how findings from the learning outcomes process have been utilized to address decisions to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum (including decisions to alter the program’s desired outcomes). If such decision-making has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur. **[Please limit your response to 200 words or less per item]**

   The assessment tools described above indicate that the students enrolled in the Deaf Studies Program are, in general, learning to sign at a high intermediate level, with the ability to express themselves in sign language in informal and structured settings, and to comprehend other signers with a minimum of difficulty. The students are able to identify current situations and issues in the Deaf community and apply their learning through the program through an analysis of the root causes and effects of the issues.

   In addition to the key assessments used to evaluate student or completer performance already reported above, other formal (i.e., student course evaluations) and informal means of assessing our program can be undertaken such as student admission into Interpreter Training Programs or employment of graduates in fields relating to Deaf and Hard of Hearing people.

   As an example, recently five of the Program’s students who graduated with a B.A. in Deaf Studies applied and were accepted into the Interpreter Preparation Program at American River College. This indicates that the program had provided them with sufficient foundational knowledge and ASL skill to be deemed qualified to enter into interpreter training.

   In addition, there were 25 students working toward their Bachelor’s degree in Deaf Studies enrolled in the EDS 166 Field Experience class, which is designed to be a “capstone” course for students in this program. Of these 25, all but 1 (who needed to take an ‘Incomplete’) received passing credit for this course. This is another indicator that the Deaf Studies Program is accomplishing its goal of providing a linguistic and knowledge foundation for future work with Deaf people.

   The Deaf Studies Program is demonstrating effectiveness at producing graduates who can interact with the Deaf community on an informal and formal basis, whether as interpreters, educators, or employees in Deaf-related organizations. The Program does provide a strong foundation of knowledge and skills in preparation for students’ future employment.

6. Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program’s learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program’s curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur. **[Please limit your response to 300 words or less]**
As of the time of this report, there has been no information available regarding the hiring of Deaf Studies students at agencies, programs or schools working with Deaf and Hard of Hearing people. The plan by which this will occur: The Deaf Studies Area Group will ask the College to allocate a minimum of 25% release time for the Deaf Studies Program Coordinator and/or a designee to have time to investigate resources and options available for how best to systematically seek data from alumni to measure the long term effects of the program's learning outcomes. Additionally, near the end of each Spring semester the instructor of the program's EDS 166 (capstone) course will gather contact information from the "soon to be" alumni. A student assistant taking EDS 199 (Special Problems) will then be assigned to contact the alumni and survey them as to the longer term effects or accomplishments of the program's learning outcomes such as employment and/or integration into post-graduate training programs.

7. Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization?

[Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

Not applicable

8. Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program’s desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment?

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

The question has been asked, "What is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?" While it is not "likely" to happen, the most powerful next step that would improve our ability to function as a group possessing a learning-outcomes organizational culture would be to move away from the "herding cats" approach of relying on so many (75%) adjunct instructors and instead hire four new full-time faculty members who would be expected to show up and participate in the "outcomes" process. The next REAL step would be to provide a minimum of 25% release time for the program coordinator position in order for the coordinator to have time to coordinate, implement, and foster the increased use of outcomes-based processes in the program.

Furthermore, within the new College of Education organization, the Deaf Studies program will be administratively housed with the other undergraduate programs. As such, attention to Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes will be examined from a broader perspective within the College.
**APPENDIX A:**  
**Expressive Proficiency Rating Form**

NAME: _________________________________     DATE: ______________

____ FLUENCY
0 points: Signing is halting and fragmentary; long, unnatural pauses or phrases left unfinished
04 points: Signing is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences
08 points: Signing is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted
12 points: Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase or continue
16 points: Signing is generally natural and continuous; only slight stumbling or unnatural pauses
20 points: Signing is natural and continuous; no unnatural pauses

____ VOCABULARY
0 to 5 points: Lacks basic signs; inadequate; inaccurate usage
6 to 10 points: Often lacks needed signs; somewhat inaccurate usage
11 to 15 points: Occasionally lacks basic signs; generally accurate usage
16 to 20 points: Rich and extensive vocabulary; very accurate usage

____ STRUCTURE
1 to 4 points: No signed phrases structurally correct
5 to 7 points: Very few signed phrases structurally correct
8 to 10 points: Some signed phrases rendered correctly, but major structural problems remain
11 to 13 points: Many correct signed phrases, but with definite structural problems
14 to 16 points: Most signed phrases rendered correctly, with some minor structural errors
17 to 20 points: Signed phrases almost always correct

____ COMPREHENSIBILITY
No signed phrases structurally correct
Almost entirely incomprehensible to native speaker of American Sign Language
5 to 7 points: Mostly incomprehensible; occasional phrases comprehensible
8 to 10 points: Many errors, about half incomprehensible
11 to 13 points: Many errors, but still comprehensible
14 to 16 points: Almost entirely comprehensible to native signer;
17 to 20 points: Only an occasional sign not comprehensible and/or no signs incomprehensible

____ FEATURES (up to 20 points)
Examples:
Negative headshake for negation
Yes/no question expression
Wh-question expression
Use of space absent referent
Horizontal or vertical sweep for plurality
Incorporation of number (time or pronouns
Inflection for degree, extent, duration, or regularity
Directionality for agency (agreement)
Use of classifiers
Etc.

____ TOTAL out of 100

____ GRADE