

California State University, Sacramento  
Humanities & Religious Studies  
6000 J Street • Mendocino Hall 2011 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6083  
T (916) 278-6444 • F (916) 278-7213 • [www.csus.edu/hum](http://www.csus.edu/hum)

February 11, 2019

**Memorandum**

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Jeffrey Brodd, Chair   
Academic Program Review Oversight Committee

SUBJECT: Program Review of the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program

The Academic Program Review Oversight Committee has reviewed the Academic Program Review report of the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program prepared by Review Team chair Jeffrey Brodd and agrees that it is ready for final approval. The Committee thanks and commends all of those involved in the review for their collegial and effective approach to the process.

The Review is ready for action by the Faculty Senate.

cc: Sheri Hembree, Chair, Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education  
Leah Geer, Coordinator, American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program  
Sasha Sidorkin, Dean, College of Education  
Kitty Kelly, Chair, Curriculum Policies Committee  
Amy Wallace, Associate Vice President, Academic Excellence  
Steve Perez, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Interim)

# **Academic Program Review Report**

## **Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program**

### **California State University, Sacramento**

#### **Review Team Chair**

Dr. Jeffrey Brodd, Department of Humanities & Religious Studies

#### **External Consultant**

Dr. Amy June Rowley, Associate Professor of American Sign Language  
California State University East Bay

**Spring 2018**

#### **Table of Contents**

Overview of the Program Review Process	p. 2
Executive Summary of Commendations and Recommendations	p. 4
Introduction	p. 7
General Information	p. 7
Overview of the ASLDS Program	p. 7
Service to Foreign Language Graduate Requirement and G.E.	p. 9
Faculty and Staff	p. 9
Facilities and Technology	p. 10
Student Affairs and Advising	p. 12
Assessment	p. 14
Focused Inquiry	p. 17
Definition of Deaf Studies	p. 17
ASL Proficiency	p. 17
ASL Curricula used at CSUS and elsewhere	p. 19
Program working practices	p. 20
Educational effectiveness and faculty access to communication	p. 21
Recommendation to the Faculty Senate	p. 21
Appendix: Assessment Tables	p. 22

## OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program underwent program review during the Spring 2018 semester, having submitted a Self-study Proposal in October, 2017. The Program submitted its Self-study in February, 2018. Per the instructions contained in the Sacramento State *Academic Program Review Manual*, the Self-study consists of three main sections:

1. General information about the program, e.g., data on students, faculty, staff, facilities, etc. (most of which is supplied by Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning);
2. A statement of intended student learning outcomes at the program level; methods for assessing them, including the use of direct measures; assessment results to date; and documentation of the use of assessment results in efforts to achieve program improvement (assistance with the preparation of which is available from the University Assessment Coordinator); and
3. The results of a focused inquiry addressing issues of particular interest/concern to the program itself, in the context of what is currently important to the college and university.

The focused inquiry (described in pp. 10-20 of the Self-study) is based on a comparative study of four other ASLDS programs: CSU Northridge; American River College (Carmichael, CA); Ohlone College (Fremont, CA); Eastern Kentucky University (Richmond); and Gallaudet University (Washington, DC). The focused inquiry examines five issues: 1) Definition of Deaf Studies; 2) ASL proficiency; 3) ASL curricula used at CSUS and elsewhere; 4) Program working practices; and 5) Educational effectiveness and faculty access to communication.

The structure of this report is based primarily on the three-section format of the Self-study. Introductory material is followed by 1) general information about the Program, 2) issues involving learning outcomes and assessment, and 3) analysis of the focused inquiry findings. Commendations and recommendations are directed to: the ASLDS Program and the division of Undergraduate Studies in Education (designated as “D”); the Deans of the College (“C”); and the Provost (“P”). A final recommendation is made to the Faculty Senate.

This program review is based on consideration of various documents and websites and on consultation with various individuals and groups:

### Persons Consulted

Dr. Leah Geer, Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator, ASLDS Program

Dr. Sheri Hembree, Chair, Undergraduate Studies in Education

Dr. Alexander M. “Sasha” Sidorkin, Dean, College of Education

Dr. Karen Davis O’Hara, Associate Dean, College of Education

Dr. Amy June Rowley (External Consultant), Associate Professor of American Sign Language  
California State University East Bay

Program faculty: Dr. Leah Geer, Dr. Evan Hibbard, Dr. Jennifer Rayman, Professor Lauren Smith, Professor Sandra Thrapp, Professor Belinda Vicars, and Dr. Bill Vicars

Dr. Amy Liu, Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment

Alumni who recently majored in ASLDS

Students in DEAF 162, Deaf Culture & Community (class visit)

### Documents Consulted

Self-Study proposal (October 17, 2017)

Self-Study: *Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: American Sign Language and Deaf Studies: Self-Study* (February, 2018):

[http://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/self\\_study\\_report/17-18\\_reports/deafstudies\\_selfstudy2018\\_finaldraft\\_revised.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/self_study_report/17-18_reports/deafstudies_selfstudy2018_finaldraft_revised.pdf)

College of Education: Undergraduate Studies website:

<http://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/undergraduate/>

- American Sign Language and Deaf Studies:  
<http://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/undergraduate/programs/overview-asl.html>

California State University, Sacramento: 2017-2018 Catalog, BA in American Sign Language/Deaf Studies: <http://catalog.csus.edu/archives/2017-2018/colleges/education/undergraduate-studies-education/-undergraduatetext>

Course syllabi: DEAF 51, 52, 53, 60, 154, 155, 161, 162, 164, 166

Assessment Documents:

- Assessment Plan, BA ASL & Deaf Studies 2016-2017:  
[http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/assessment-plans/education/deaf\\_studies\\_assessment\\_plan\\_2017\\_004.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/assessment-plans/education/deaf_studies_assessment_plan_2017_004.pdf)
- Assessment Plan, BA ASL & Deaf Studies 2015-2016:  
<http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/assessment-plans/education/assessment-plan-deaf-studies-program-2015-2016.pdf>
- Annual Assessment Report (2016-2017), BA American Sign Language & Deaf Studies:  
[http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/report\\_pdfs\\_and\\_feedback/report\\_pdfs\\_by\\_college/edu/undergrad/1617\\_asl\\_deaf.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/report_pdfs_and_feedback/report_pdfs_by_college/edu/undergrad/1617_asl_deaf.pdf)
- Feedback for the Annual Assessment Report (2016-2017):  
[http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/report\\_pdfs\\_and\\_feedback/feedback/edu\\_feedback/1617-ba-asl-deaf-pckt.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/report_pdfs_and_feedback/feedback/edu_feedback/1617-ba-asl-deaf-pckt.pdf)
- University Data Summary for the 2016-2017 Annual Assessment:  
[http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/data\\_summaries/16-17\\_prelim\\_uni\\_data\\_report.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/data_summaries/16-17_prelim_uni_data_report.pdf)

Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning: <http://www.csus.edu/oir/>

- *Fact Book Fall 2017: Undergraduate Studies in Education*:  
<http://www.csus.edu/oir/datacenter/departmentfactbooks/undergraduatestudies17.pdf>
- *The University Fact Book: Fall 2016*: <http://www.csus.edu/oir/datacenter/universityfactbook/>

*External Consultant's Report: American Sign Language and Deaf Studies (ASLDS) Program*,  
Dr. Amy June Rowley (May 14, 2018)

Program Review (Office of Academic Affairs): <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/>

- *Academic Program Review Manual* (REV May, 2016):  
<http://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/programreviewmanual2016.pdf>

Office of Academic Program Assessment: <http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/>

ASL Club Constitution

Lissa Stapleton, "The Disabled Academy: The Experiences of Deaf Faculty at Predominantly Hearing Institutions," *NEA Higher Education Journal*, Winter (2015): 55-69

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Commendations to the ASLDS Program and Undergraduate Studies in Education:**

**Commendation D1:** The ASLDS Program actively and effectively promotes "the understanding of deaf people as a linguistic and cultural group" and thoughtful analysis of relevant stereotypes and of meaningful policies.

**Commendation D2:** The ASLDS Program provides the University with valuable means of fulfilling graduation requirements, most notably through courses in American Sign Language.

**Commendation D3:** The ASLDS faculty are dedicated educators both in the classroom and beyond, actively engaging in a wide variety of organizations and activities.

**Commendation D4:** The leadership of the ASLDS Program, Program Coordinator Leah Geer and Undergraduate Studies Chair Sheri Hembree, have shown outstanding commitment to the quality of the review process and, in general, have worked diligently to ensure excellence.

**Commendation D5:** The American Sign Language Club is a thriving student-directed organization that aligns well with the Program's mission.

**Commendation D6:** All fourteen of the required courses for the ASLDS major are offered both semesters, affording students relative ease in scheduling, and the Program and its faculty are willing to accommodate students by overenrolling sections.

**Commendation D7:** Development of a policy providing a list of suitable electives for transfer students indicates the Program's conscientiousness with regard to the issue of unit credits and is potentially a good means of improvement.

**Commendation D8:** Development of common core syllabi for each level of ASL instruction is a significant step toward enhancing curricular consistency.

**Commendation D9:** Comparative analysis of other programs, for purposes of producing the Self-study's focused inquiry and for moving forward with steps toward improvement, provides an effective means of determining best practices and means for implementing them.

### **Recommendations to the ASLDS Program and Undergraduate Studies in Education:**

**Recommendation D1 (and C1):** The ASLDS Program, Undergraduate Studies in Education, and the College of Education should explore what is possible to secure optimal classrooms.

**Recommendation D2:** Continue to analyze enrollment patterns and section availability to afford students good scheduling options while also ensuring high quality.

**Recommendation D3:** Analyze the situation with regard to transfer students and take whatever steps are deemed optimal in order to ensure that unit credits are assigned appropriately.

**Recommendation D4:** Continue to develop an approach to advising that enhances sharing of information and practices in order to ensure that advice is provided consistently to all major and minor students.

**Recommendation D5:** Drawing on the initiatives set forth in the Self-study and on the recommendations and examples provided by Dr. Rowley in her external consultant's report, and working with the Office of Academic Program Assessment, continue to develop an effective system for the assessment of student learning based on sound program learning outcomes and utilizing direct measures of achievement.

**Recommendation D6:** Continue to determine and then implement effective means of increasing hours of student engagement with American Sign Language, paying close attention to Dr. Rowley's suggestions on p. 3 of her external consultant's report.

**Recommendation D7:** Regulate instructor ASL proficiency.

**Recommendation D8:** Continue to strive toward a more standardized language curriculum; this likely will require adoption of one textbook for each level of ASL instruction.

**Recommendation D9:** Consider curricular revisions that would help ensure appropriate pace of presentation of ASL material and that would enhance the Deaf Studies component.

**Recommendation D10:** Consider developing a curriculum and pedagogy policy addressing such issues as principles for new course proposals, determination of courses offered, and timely feedback regarding student work.

**Recommendation D11:** Develop a language or communication policy to ensure optimal facilitation of student learning.

**Recommendations to the Dean, College of Education:**

**Recommendation C1 (and D1):** The ASLDS Program, Undergraduate Studies in Education, and the College of Education should do what is possible to secure optimal classrooms.

**Recommendation C2:** Strive to establish a fully equipped laboratory space, ideally to be located in Eureka Hall.

**Recommendation C3:** Consider carefully the GPA discrepancy between the College of Education and the University at large, and, if deemed necessary, take steps to address possible causes of the discrepancy.

**Recommendation C4 (and P2):** Strive to expedite the offering of positions to temporary faculty so that Sacramento State can better compete with area community colleges for good faculty and so that the professional lives of those faculty can be made better.

**Recommendation C5 (and P3):** Take appropriate steps to confront audism and to help Deaf culture thrive on our campus; for example, consider securing a full-time, staff interpreter.

**Recommendations to the University Provost:**

**Recommendation P1:** Encourage the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Enhancement to facilitate means of access to information specific to individual programs like ASLDS.

**Recommendation P2 (and C4):** Strive to expedite the offering of positions to temporary faculty so that Sacramento State can better compete with area community colleges for good faculty and so that the professional lives of those faculty can be made better.

**Recommendation P3 (and C5):** Take appropriate steps to confront audism and to help Deaf culture thrive on our campus; for example, consider securing a full-time, staff interpreter.

**Recommendation to the Faculty Senate:**

Based on this program review, the Self-study report prepared by the American Sign Language and Deaf Studies program, and the external consultant's report, the Review Team recommends that the degree programs in ASLDS be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

## INTRODUCTION

In her External Consultant's report (p. 7), Dr. Amy June Rowley offers this positive overview of the American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program:

My visit to Sac State allowed me to see that there are many areas that Sac State ASLDS program shined and these should be emphasized and capitalized on. I was very impressed with the fact that the ASLDS has FIVE faculty for this program! That's a great resource that could really push the academic standing of coursework and offerings. I was also impressed with the depth of discussions regarding gender neutrality. This is cutting edge and sorely needed for the ASL curriculum in America. Sac State can be leaders in pushing for a variety of Deaf Studies coursework that reflect the diversity of the University, the city and the state.

The "Chair's Welcome" page of the Division of Undergraduate Studies website notes that this is the only Deaf Studies BA program in northern California, and that American Sign Language is the third most used language in the United States.

This program review of ASLDS confirms this generally positive perspective. There are many fundamental pieces in place that make Sacramento State's a strong program and potentially the northern California equivalent of CSU Northridge, which is generally regarded as the state's premier program.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

### Overview of the ASLDS Program

The American Sign Language and Deaf Studies Program is housed in the Undergraduate Studies academic area of the College of Education. Recent structural changes within the College of Education might give the false impression that ASLDS is a new program, but in fact, the program has existed for many years, first as a certificate program, then offering a minor, and now also offering a major. Courses formerly were designated as EDS; now they are designated as DEAF.

The Program serves three main constituencies of students:

- Undergraduates who major in ASLDS
- Undergraduates who minor in ASLDS
- Undergraduate students fulfilling the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement (DEAF 52) or General Education requirements in Areas C2 (DEAF 52) or D (DEAF 60)

### **BA in ASLDS**

The BA requires a minimum of 41 units (DEAF 165, Seminar: Current Issues in the Deaf World, can be repeated, as the topic varies; hence the possibility of more than 41 units in the major). The Self-study's Table 1 (Major/minor courses offered; p. 3) cites the number of sections offered Fall



2017 and Spring 2018, along with indicating which courses are also required for the Minor and which involve a voicing interpreter (DEAF 60, 161, and 162).

Enrollment in the BA Program steadily increased from 2012 to 2016 (per *Fact Book Fall 2017* Table 5):

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
73	92	100	109	143

According to the Self-study (p. 8), as of the 2017-2018 academic year there were 259 declared majors—a remarkable increase over the past year, even given the upward trend of the previous five years.

The number of BA degrees conferred has been increasing since 2014 (per *Fact Book Fall 2017* Table 13: Degrees Conferred):

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
30	26	23	26	35

The program website offers this description of the BA:

The American Sign Language and Deaf Studies major 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 effecting change for the betterment of Deaf people and the hard-of-hearing community.

As noted in the Self-study (p. 12), this emphasis on analyzing stereotypes and policies sets Sacramento State's program apart from those at the four institutions compared in the focused inquiry. This program review has discerned significant reasons to affirm that this emphasis is indeed appropriate, for the faculty and students in ASLDS and also for our campus and community. Within the College of Education specifically, ASLDS faculty have actively and successfully sought to change the culture with regard to these issues. The class visit to DEAF 162 indicated a sophisticated approach to analyzing these issues, on this particular day with special emphasis on the problem of language deprivation and the controversies involved with cochlear implants. Without question, the 30 students enrolled in this course acquire enlightened perspectives about stereotypes and policies relating to Deaf and hard-of-hearing people.

**Commendation D1:** The ASLDS Program actively and effectively promotes “the understanding of deaf people as a linguistic and cultural group” and thoughtful analysis of relevant stereotypes and of meaningful policies.

This program review is hampered somewhat by inability to access data pertaining specifically to the ASLDS Program. Most of the tables in *Fact Book Fall 2017: Undergraduate Studies in Education* lump the various programs together; of the fifteen tables, only three (Table 5: All Student Enrollment by Program and Concentration, Table 8: Course Enrollment, and Table 13: Degrees Conferred) provide data specific to ASLDS. The negative effects of this shortcoming for the program review process are undoubtedly much more problematic for the day-to-day administrative work of the Program and the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education.

**Recommendation P1:** Encourage the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Enhancement to facilitate means of access to information specific to individual programs like ASLDS.

### **Minor in ASLDS**

The Minor requires 23 units. The Minor serves students in many degree programs, such as Childhood Development, Liberal Studies, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Psychology, and Communication Studies.

### **Service to Foreign Language Graduation Requirement and General Education**

During the Spring 2018 semester and, on average, during previous semesters, course offerings that fulfill graduation requirements (or, in the case of DEAF 51, is a prerequisite to such courses) enrolled the following number of students (per Spring 2018 Schedule of Classes and *Fact Book Fall 2017* Table 8: Course Enrollment):

- DEAF 51 (prerequisite for DEAF 52): 369 in Spring 2018
  - From Fall 2013 through Spring 2017, DEAF 51 enrolled 318.8 per semester
- DEAF 52 (Foreign Language Graduation Requirement and GE Area C2): 346 in Spring 2018
  - From Fall 2013 through Spring 2017, DEAF 52 enrolled 261.9 per semester
- DEAF 60 (GE Area D): 75 in Spring 2018
  - From Spring 2014 through Spring 2017, DEAF 60 enrolled 68.4 per semester

Notably, seventeen of the twenty-nine sections of these courses offered in Spring 2018 were over-enrolled vis-à-vis the initial Enrollment Capacity, which on one hand shows willingness on the part of the Program and its faculty to take exceptional measures to accommodate students. On the other hand, over-enrollment also is an indicator of possible cause for change, which this report will take up below in the section on Student Affairs and Advising.

**Commendation D2:** The ASLDS Program provides the University with valuable means of fulfilling graduation requirements, most notably through courses in American Sign Language.

### **Faculty and Staff**

There are currently five full-time, tenure-track or tenured faculty in the ASLDS Program. There are about ten temporary faculty (fluctuating depending on instructional needs). The Self-study (pp. 3-6) provides brief but informative biographies of these five full-time faculty members, along with a summary description of the temporary faculty.

All indications reveal a faculty highly committed to excellence in pedagogy and to fulfilling the Program's mission with regard to promoting understanding of deaf culture. Faculty biographies provided by the Self-study indicate wide-ranging engagement in organizations and activities pertinent for the deaf community of the greater Sacramento area and beyond, such as the Interpreter Preparation Program (IPP) at American River College and the editorial board of the

*Journal of American Sign Languages and Literatures* and the *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*.

**Commendation D3:** The ASLDS faculty are dedicated educators both in the classroom and beyond, actively engaging in a wide variety of organizations and activities.

This program review has benefitted greatly from effective and efficient leadership, especially on the part of Dr. Leah Geer, Program Coordinator of ASLDS, and Dr. Sheri Hembree, Chair of Undergraduate Studies in Education. The Self-study is exceptionally substantive, with its 10-page focused inquiry section and its concluding section in which the Program offers its own recommendations for improvement; including this section goes above and beyond the normal demands as stipulated by the *Academic Program Review Manual*, and it has been very helpful for this review. The Self-study expands on the original plans set forth in the Self-study Proposal by including in the focused inquiry five rather than four issues for analysis (having added “ASL Curricula used at CSUS and elsewhere”), thus showing a conscientious approach to the process. The Self-study consistently exhibits honest self-assessment and does not shy away from proposing changes, some of which likely will not prove simple to implement. Dr. Geer and Dr. Hembree, and indeed all involved were very helpful and punctual with determining the external consultant’s visit schedule and other aspects of this program review. More generally, this review has found that Dr. Geer and Dr. Hembree provide an effective leadership team and that the recommendations set forth herein will be given due consideration and attempts at implementation.

**Commendation D4:** The leadership of the ASLDS Program, Program Coordinator Leah Geer and Undergraduate Studies Chair Sheri Hembree, have shown outstanding commitment to the quality of the review process and, in general, have worked diligently to ensure excellence.

The Program is assisted by the administrative staff of the College of Education, which includes two Administrative Support Coordinator II positions and two temporary positions. The staff person specifically assigned to the ASLDS Program is Administrative Support Coordinator II Ryanne Green-Quarles.

### **Facilities and Technology**

The Program’s faculty offices are located in Eureka Hall. Eureka 401 houses Student Support Services. Eureka 307G and 313E are most commonly utilized as classrooms; Eureka 320, also a classroom, features a bulletin board that bears the label “ASL Club” and a showcase with a *Deaf Life* (10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary) poster and photographs of faculty and students.

During the external consultant’s visit, we attended a class session (DEAF 162) in Eureka 313E. The less-than-ideal spatial configuration and type of furniture in this classroom led Dr. Rowley to inquire about classroom facilities in general, and so we made a point of visiting other classrooms. Tahoe 1002, in which another ASLDS class was being held, was deemed by Dr. Rowley to be a poor facility. It is rectangular in shape, with the long side at front and back, and is equipped with stationary desks. We also happened to visit AIRC 3006, which she deemed

excellent; it is the right shape, it is equipped with desks that swivel, and it has the right “smart room” equipment. A thorough review of classrooms utilized during the Spring 2018 semester reveals that only two of the twenty-four—Eureka 320 and Mendocino 1024—are equipped with swivel, individual desks that could easily be rearranged to produce the desired horseshoe-shaped configuration, as described in the Self-study (pp. 6-7). Ideally, the desks should have retractable writing surfaces.

Dr. Rowley summarizes her perspective on classroom facilities on p. 7 of her report:

Classrooms visited were not conducive to allowing students to see each other, thus making ASL courses teacher-centered as opposed to student-centered. This further oppresses ASL as a language because students are not learning how to listen to ASL with others. Mediated classrooms had large tables which could not be moved. Also, classrooms and offices were not equipped with visual fire alarms or other types of warning systems, thus forcing Deaf teachers to depend on hearing (possibly non-signing) students to inform of dangers.

She recommends that the College of Education “identify a few rooms that are large enough for ASL courses, that meet expectations identified in the self-study and have a projector and computer since ASL courses depend heavily on technology” and that classrooms should be ADA compliant (p. 7).

The Self-study, in its list of recommendations for improvement, includes three practical steps:

- “develop a list of classroom characteristics that maximize access to communication in ASLDS classrooms”;
- “work to get priority status for the rooms best suited for ASL instruction”; and
- “work to get updated furniture.”

On our campus, at least as of the last few years, securing optimal classrooms has become a more complicated task because of decrease in control by colleges and centralization in the Office of Space Management. ADA compliance is overseen in part by the Office of Facilities Management. Efforts toward improvement will therefore need to involve collaboration by various campus entities.

**Recommendation D1/C1:** The ASLDS Program, Undergraduate Studies in Education, and the College of Education should explore what is possible to secure optimal classrooms.

The Self-study comments on the desirability of a “fully-stocked ASL laboratory” (p. 21), noting that “ASLDS does not have a dedicated lab with a book/video library to which students have access, and computers with high quality cameras, with which they can complete video projects, should they not have their own recording equipment” (p. 6). Especially in light of the need to increase hours of engagement with ASL (discussed below), a good laboratory space is indeed desirable.

**Recommendation C2:** Strive to establish a fully equipped laboratory space, ideally to be located in Eureka Hall.

## **Student Affairs and Advising**

The ASLDS Program sponsors the student-directed American Sign Language Club. Faculty Advisor Mela Bennett reports that the Club provides general meetings, social events, signing hour, occasional Deaf speakers/workshops/panels to provide more resources, networking and educational information outside of Deaf Studies through community involvement with the deaf community in the Greater Sacramento area. In other words, it shows language and culture in action outside of the classroom. There are currently 183 members, and the nine officer positions have all been filled for the 2018-2019 academic year—both indicators of a thriving student club. Dr. Evan Hibbard will become Faculty Advisor commencing Fall 2018. The ASL Club Constitution sets forth its Statement of Purpose:

It is our desire to empower those who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing by promoting activism and awareness of the Deaf community, their cultural issues and their practices in the greater Sacramento area. To provide an environment that allows the Deaf community to become involved with the education of students who are interested in learning/practicing American Sign Language through general meetings and social gatherings.

**Commendation D5:** The American Sign Language Club is a thriving student-directed organization that aligns well with the Program's mission.

The Self-study (p. 8, including Figure 8) indicates that the ASLDS Program has been quite successful with regard to degree completion and time-to-degree:

From Fall 2012 to Spring 2017, ASLDS has awarded 156 Bachelor's degrees. The average time to degree completion for native freshmen is 5.5 years. Transfer students complete their degree in 2.6-2.7 years, on average. There are currently – in the 2017-2018 academic year – 259 declared ASLDS majors. Of these, all save seven who are on probation, are students in good standing with anticipated graduation semesters ranging from this upcoming summer 2018 to summer 2023.

This success undoubtedly is achieved in part because of the good availability of classes. Also as noted in the Self-study (pp. 2 and 3, including Table 1), all fourteen courses required in the major are now offered both semesters. Some challenges persist with regard to commuter students or others who desire Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday schedules. Night classes are a challenge for parents who do not have child care during the period from 4:30 to 7:30, when some upper-division courses are offered. As noted previously in this report, seventeen of the twenty-nine sections of DEAF 51, 52, and 60 offered in Spring 2018 were over-enrolled vis-à-vis the initial Enrollment Capacity. This willingness to overextend is commendable but also suggests need to consider whether course offerings are sufficient. Accommodation of students and their scheduling preferences ought not compromise the quality of their education; over-enrollment might have a detrimental effect on teaching and learning.

**Commendation D6:** All fourteen of the required courses for the ASLDS major are offered both semesters, affording students relative ease in scheduling, and the Program and its faculty are willing to accommodate students by overenrolling sections.

**Recommendation D2:** Continue to analyze enrollment patterns and section availability to afford students good scheduling options while also ensuring high quality.

### Unit Credits for Transfer Students

Transfer students face challenges with regard to the intermeshing of their previous coursework with the ASLDS requirements at Sacramento State. The Self-study (p. 22) suggests approaches to alleviating problems:

Due to the high volume of transfer students, ASLDS must develop a second track for students arriving with Associate level degrees in Deaf Studies and/or Interpreting. Coursework could include designated courses currently offered in other departments that would provide them with general knowledge that would inform their future career. It could also involve more advanced course work in Deaf Studies. Courses could include the study of first- and/or second-language acquisition, advanced linguistic analysis, communication studies, deaf education, global Deaf Studies, Introduction to International Sign, among others.

The ASLDS Program recently developed and ratified a policy that provides a list of recommended electives for students with an Associate of Arts degree or similar background in ASLDS that helps avoid redundancy when taking theory-oriented courses for the major. Such students are allowed, for example, to satisfy the Deaf History requirement by taking another history-type course. And so, one approach to alleviating challenges for transfer students has already been initiated.

**Commendation D7:** Development of a policy providing a list of suitable electives for transfer students indicates the Program's conscientiousness with regard to the issue of unit credits and is potentially a good means of improvement.

Full implementation of all of the approaches mentioned in the Self-study would likely prove daunting, presumably involving additional courses in ASLDS. The standard curriculum at Gallaudet University, with its wide range of course options in various disciplinary fields (for example, all 9 of the units in the "required related courses" category for the Deaf Studies BA can be History courses), provides a model. But because of the special opportunities offered by Gallaudet University, it also serves to caution against overreaching in the face of practical limitations.

Dr. Rowley in her external consultant's report notes that the issue of unit credits to transfer students "was a big complaint from alumni," and that the three alumni with whom she met, all of whom were transfer students, claimed to have needed to "start all over again with ASL courses" (p. 6). She recommends either providing a means for granting retroactive credit, through establishment of a screening process, or, if this is not possible, then "every effort to accept transfer credit should be made, then a plan to allow students to [earn] credits for the major in other ways should be developed through independent studies, fieldwork or other electives" (p. 7).

The Self-study (pp. 7 and 8, including Figure 3) reveals fairly similar time-to-degree patterns (5.5 years for native students and 2.6-2.7 for transfer students), and so perhaps the situation is not as dire as these three alumni made it seem. It might seem fairly simple to grant equivalence for

community college courses as lower-division courses within the ASLDS curriculum, and the Sacramento State Program has had articulation agreements with other institutions. This does not, however, ensure that transfer students are ready for courses here. Dr. Rowley's proposal regarding granting of retroactive credit through establishment of a screening process seems the better alternative for language courses. Another problem involves mismatch of specific curricula; for example, transfer students often get credit for DEAF 60 (Introduction to Deaf Studies) even though the courses taken are more like DEAF 162 (Deaf Culture & Community), which they are required to take here.

**Recommendation D3:** Analyze the situation with regard to transfer students and take whatever steps are deemed optimal in order to ensure that unit credits are assigned appropriately.

### **Advising**

Dr. Rowley, based on discussion with alumni and current students, notes reports of "conflicting information from different advisors. When one advisor said there were no options/choices, another advisor presented options." She recommends: "Faculty advisors should work together to make sure they are on same page with advising for all students. Possibly get training from a central advising service as well to ensure faculty know the same thing general advisors know" (p. 6).

The Program's website indicates that advisors are assigned by last name of student, and that there are currently four faculty who share advising duties: Drs. Geer, Grushkin, Rayman, and Vicars. It seems a very common challenge across campus to balance the benefits of shared advising with the benefits of a more centralized approach to advising. Obviously, with 259 declared majors, advising in ASLDS cannot be left solely to the Program Coordinator or any other individual, and so the current approach is basically sound. Recently, commencing Spring 2018 with plans to continue during the summer and fall, Dr. Jennifer Rayman has been working in the Student Success Center. Her training there has enabled the Program to depend more upon one person and thus to move toward a more centralized approach to advising.

Following up on Dr. Rowley's suggestions would likely further enhance the effectiveness of advising. Other potential means of improvement include: development of an advising policy, and maintaining a shared drive or Canvas site for keeping documents, information, and notes in one place.

**Recommendation D4:** Continue to develop an approach to advising that enhances sharing of information and practices in order to ensure that advice is provided consistently to all major and minor students.

### **ASSESSMENT**

(See also Appendix: Assessment Tables, at the end of this document)

The Self-study (pp. 9-10) readily acknowledges shortcomings with regard to assessment, and suggests “several potential remedies,” including:

a standardized curriculum, placement tests and exit exams, increased (and measured) proficiency of ASL instructors, as well as requiring students to take a national, standardized assessment of ASL proficiency (the ASLPI) as part of their program of work here (p. 10).

In the concluding section, the Self-study calls for “normed assessment measures to ensure that our students are graduating with sufficiently high levels of ASL proficiency” (p. 22). This paragraph goes on to spell out two sound standards of achievement: “Upon graduation, [students] should be able to converse with any person in ASL on any topic, without needing them to slow down. They should be able to apply to, be accepted into, and excel in Interpreter Preparation Programs...” Program Coordinator Dr. Leah Geer has secured summer project funding from the College of Education that she is applying toward enhancing curricular consistency through development of a common syllabus for each level of ASL instruction. While flexible enough to allow for individual faculty to determine course details, these syllabi will set forth for each level a common signature assignment and an assignment suitable for program assessment. Examination of Dr. Geer’s syllabi for DEAF 51, 53, 154, and 155 reveals sound lists of course objectives with measured advancement moving upward through the levels.

**Commendation D8:** Development of common core syllabi for each level of ASL instruction is a significant step toward enhancing curricular consistency.

Dr. Geer’s syllabus project and the other suggested remedies are very much on track toward producing a sound assessment system. There also need to be suitable *direct* measures (surveys, including the alumni survey, are helpful, but they are indirect measures)—a component that Dr. Geer is helping to develop as part of the syllabus project. As the Self-study also acknowledges, it does not suffice to use course grades as assessment data. Dr. Rowley on p. 6 of her report concurs with this, and sets forth two recommendations directly relating to enhancing assessment:

Each course should have student learning outcomes that are measurable and clearly identify what will be covered rather than vaguely state general skills which will be addressed (See Appendix B).

Program Learning outcomes should be developed and courses which support specific PLO’s should be identified. Within those courses, an assessment plan should be developed to determine how assessment is being carried out. These PLO’s should not be measured by one assignment or one grade. They should consist of a variety of tools and activities to determine how PLO’s can be met (See Appendix C).

The list of model PLOs and the example of how to assess one of them provided in Appendix C are very helpful. These PLOs can fruitfully be compared with the Program’s current list of Program Learning Outcomes set forth in the April 1, 2017 version of the Assessment Plan:

PLO #1: At graduation, students should demonstrate a High Intermediate level of expressive and receptive communication skills in ASL. This includes the ability to converse with a native or near-native ASL speaker with only minimal need for repetition or clarification in either the expressive or receptive realms while sharing jokes, stories, directions, and information of an academic or social nature.



PLO #2: At graduation, students should be able to identify major historical events, laws, types of educational programs and communication options, and components of Deaf culture with at least 70% accuracy.

PLO #3: At graduation, given a variety of scenarios, students should be able to identify and explain whether or not such a situation is the result of privilege and oppression, and how intercultural conflicts can be mitigated with at least 70% accuracy.

PLO #4: At graduation, students should be able to identify areas of weakness in the political, social, educational and/or legal environment for Deaf people, and suggest concrete, plausible ways in which these might be remediated for at least two of the above areas.

PLO #5: At graduation, students should be able to identify and state at least three examples of Deaf contributions to society in the arts, humanities, sciences, and daily life and explain how society benefits from these contributions.

PLO #6: At graduation, students should be able to describe and explain at least three ways in which communication and understanding/cooperation between Hearing and Deaf people creates benefits for society as a whole.

PLO #7: At graduation, given background information on the parentage, educational history, communicational upbringing and choices, and other relevant information regarding a hypothetical Deaf person, students should be able to outline and explain potential ways in which such a person might be impacted by their given background, or ways in which other Deaf and/or Hearing people might react to and interact with this person.

PLO #8: At graduation, students should be able to identify and describe their own personal abilities, skills, and understandings as they relate to Deaf people and the Deaf community, and state to what degree they are personally able to connect to or integrate with Deaf people on a social and professional level. Students should also be able to identify and suggest ways in which they can improve their own personal competencies and relationships in regard to the Deaf community.

**Recommendation D5:** Drawing on the initiatives set forth in the Self-study and on the recommendations and examples provided by Dr. Rowley in her external consultant's report, and working with the Office of Academic Program Assessment, continue to develop an effective system for the assessment of student learning based on sound program learning outcomes and utilizing direct measures of achievement.

In its information on "Assessment of PLOs," the Program's Assessment Plan prescribes a standard of 70% of students meeting the minimum of C or better in DEAF 155. Aside from the problem with dependence on course grades as measures (noted above), this points to a more general problem that seems to persist in the College of Education at large. Table 11: Grades and Course GPA by Levels in the *Fact Book Fall 2017* indicates that GPAs in the College are far above the University's average: for lower-division courses, 3.28 vs. 2.71; for upper-division courses, 3.46 vs. 2.99. At nearly .5 percentage points higher than the University GPA, the College GPA suggests possible need to address problematic grade inflation. Because of the aforementioned limitation in the data set provided by the *Fact Book*, it is not possible to ascertain specific programmatic GPAs or grade distribution without deeper analysis.

**Recommendation C3:** Consider carefully the GPA discrepancy between the College of Education and the University at large, and, if deemed necessary, take steps to address possible causes of the discrepancy.

## **FOCUSED INQUIRY**

As noted in the opening section of this report, the focused inquiry (described in pp. 10-20 of the Self-study) is based on a comparative study of four other ASLDS programs: CSU Northridge; American River College (Carmichael, CA); Ohlone College (Fremont, CA); Eastern Kentucky University (Richmond); and Gallaudet University (Washington, DC). The focused inquiry examines five issues: 1) Definition of Deaf Studies; 2) ASL proficiency; 3) ASL curricula used at CSUS and elsewhere; 4) Program working practices; and 5) Educational effectiveness and faculty access to communication. This section of the report is organized based on these five issues.

### **1. Definition of Deaf Studies**

Commendation D1 (above) compliments the ASLDS Program for its emphasis on promoting understanding of deaf culture. The focused inquiry's comparative study found that, while addressing stereotypes is an objective unique to Sacramento State's self-definition, two other institutions—American River College and Gallaudet University—also assert via the programs' statements “the notion that understanding community is essential to Deaf Studies” (Self-study, p. 12). In general, this comparative approach, enabling informed perspective on the field well beyond its historical manifestation on our own campus, is laudable, providing means of considering best practices and how to implement them.

**Commendation D9:** Comparative analysis of other programs, for purposes of producing the Self-study's focused inquiry and for moving forward with steps toward improvement, provides an effective means of determining best practices and means for implementing them.

### **2. ASL proficiency**

The Self-study (p. 13) states:

Anecdotally, and before the self-study was undertaken, the greatest concern with our program was the level of ASL proficiency with which our students graduated. We have examined this issue from a variety of angles. These synthesized data all seem to suggest that we need a measure of ASL proficiency, which, regardless of curriculum (though we hope to standardize the language curriculum), assesses the language skills with which students should graduate. If they are not able to pass this testing metric, they'd not be able to graduate despite our efforts and desire to see our students receive their degrees.

Implementing a sound measure of ASL proficiency is a good idea and has been addressed above in the statements on unit credits for transfer students and, more generally, in the section on assessment.

Dr. Rowley in her report emphasizes need for increased hours of student engagement with ASL, both within the classroom and without. She cites in her report (p. 1) some quite remarkable statistics:

Students learning commonly taught Foreign Languages such as French, Spanish, German or Italian can attain general professional proficiency after 720 hours of training (Hart-Gonzalez & Lindemann, 1993; Jacobs, 1996; Kemp, 1998). These particular languages are classified as category 1 languages which are easier to learn. By contrast, Jacobs (1996) determined ASL is a category 4 language which is the most difficult to learn and requires about 1320 hours to reach general professional language proficiency.

Dr. Rowley continues on p. 2 to provide a detailed assessment of the situation here with regard to hours, including her estimate that “students have coursework to earn between 615 to 660 hours in class only.” She continues: “While 615-660 is well below the 1320 hours that the program should strive for, even more concerning is the actual number of ASL dedicated hours that were uncovered in this review. Out of 14 courses majors must take, 10 or 11 are actually taught in ASL. Three, or sometimes four courses used an interpreter.” She suggests that theory courses devoid of an interpreter also be offered. On p. 3 of her report, Dr. Rowley lists six additional suggestions for helping to remedy the shortage of hours, one of which proposes a four-year designation of hours, adding up to 1320.

Dr. Leah Geer’s DEAF 51 syllabus indicates that the course addresses this need of additional hours through the “Out-of-class enrichment” component:

Each student will need to devote multiple hours per week on outside assignments and learning activities. This time is vital for optimal acquisition of ASL and understanding of deaf culture. The activities constitute a notable portion of each student’s grade. I suggest you plan time in your schedules each week to participate in and complete all out-of-class enrichment activities. Additional details about each of the activities described below will be provided in class. Assigned readings on Deaf culture will involve discussion posts on SacCT, which will be graded under this category.

Professor Lauren Smith’s DEAF 52 syllabus lists as a course requirement attendance of two community events. Professor Mela Bennett’s DEAF 53 syllabus lists as a requirement Deaf Community interactions, stipulating that the interaction must last for at least an hour in order for the student to earn credit. These sorts of approaches, fortified through the activities orchestrated by the ASL Club, seem to be on the right track toward increasing hours of engagement.

**Recommendation D6:** Continue to determine and then implement effective means of increasing hours of student engagement with American Sign Language, paying close attention to Dr. Rowley’s suggestions on p. 3 of her external consultant’s report.

The Self-study (p. 22) states: “Another way to improve student ASL proficiency is to regulate instructor ASL proficiency...” To the extent that there are problems in this regard, regulating proficiency seems to be absolutely essential. Indications are that there are in our community qualified ASL instructors not yet in the current official pool of temporary faculty.

**Recommendation D7:** Regulate instructor ASL proficiency.

A significant problem faced by the ASLDS Program and by other academic units on campus involves the late scheduling of temporary faculty assignments at Sacramento State relative to the scheduling at local community colleges. Qualified faculty often must decide whether or not to accept positions at community colleges that are officially offered months prior to official offers from our campus. This problem of needing to wait so long for offers is obviously also detrimental to the professional lives of temporary faculty. Perhaps there are ways to ensure that schedule-building is completed sooner. It would seem that, if this can be accomplished at community colleges with similar enrollments (American River College, for example, lists on its website a current enrollment of 29,133 students), it could be done on our campus.

**Recommendation C4/P2:** Strive to expedite the offering of positions to temporary faculty so that Sacramento State can better compete with area community colleges for good faculty and so that the professional lives of those faculty can be made better.

### **3. ASL Curricula used at CSUS and elsewhere**

Dr. Rowley in her report (p. 5) states as one of four recommendations under the sub-heading, “Inconsistency in syllabi and ASL textbook used”: “[The] Program as a whole should adopt a textbook that supports a spiral educational approach as well as additional material to streamline a cultural approach with beginning level courses.” Whereas it is understandable why there might be disagreement over which textbook to use, it seems essential that the Program decides upon one general curriculum of language instruction, which presumably means deciding on one textbook. Dr. Rowley offers as a second of these four recommendations: “A uniform syllabus should be adopted in all courses with multiple sections especially in the language courses where each course is expected to support specific student learning outcomes” (p. 5). This relates to an observation she made in discussion with alumni and current students: “Issues included having vague syllabi and not having clear course, or assignment expectations” (p. 6). The Self-study offers as one of its self-recommendations that “ASLDS must standardize their language curriculum” (p. 23). Dr. Rowley offers sound rationale in her report (p. 5):

With several sections of the same course offered, it is essential to ensure that each teacher commits to following a uniform syllabus as well as signature assignments which allow for accurate program assessments to take place instead of using student’s grades for program evaluations.

Dr. Geer’s summer syllabus project is already making strides in this direction.

**Recommendation D8:** Continue to strive toward a more standardized language curriculum; this likely will require adoption of one textbook for each level of ASL instruction.

Dr. Rowley addresses another related concern regarding curriculum, this one about pace of presentation of the material. She expresses specific concern over

how much was actually taught in a 3-credit ASL course... Other universities using the same text with 3 credit course tend to finish half to 2/3 of the book per semester. Signing Naturally text was designed for a 3 credit lecture and 3 credit lab course (close to 5 hours a week) for a semester program so the number of hours is significantly different than what is offered at Sac State (p. 6).

She offers three recommendations for addressing this concern over pace of presentation:

- Modify the courses so the content is taught at a reasonable pace to ensure students have sufficient time to master the material taught.
- Add a lab component if possible, this will allow students to have more time to master the material, and could prevent having to modify the content.
- Add another level of ASL since a study of BA degree programs in ASL showed that all have ASL 1-6 (Rowley, 2014) (p. 6).

Addressing a different curricular issue, Dr. Rowley recommends enhancing the Deaf Studies component:

Electives for Deaf Studies need to be fleshed out. The current program reflects an ASL Studies program (language based). The variety of faculty interests could allow for a breadth of Deaf Studies topics and allow for more electives for students who are interested in Deaf Studies instead of ASL (p. 7).

Two of the programs analyzed in the Self-study's focused inquiry, CSU Northridge and Gallaudet University, provide especially provocative curricular models for further development of the Deaf Studies component.

**Recommendation D9:** Consider curricular revisions that would help ensure appropriate pace of presentation of ASL material and that would enhance the Deaf Studies component.

Two further curricular issues surfaced during this program review that deserve brief attention here. As in seemingly most every academic unit on our campus, professors in ASLDS sometimes succumb to the temptation of designing and then choosing to teach courses based on what it is they want to teach as opposed to what might be optimal for facilitating student learning per the programmatic mission statement and learning goals. A second issue involves timely feedback regarding student work. It might prove pragmatic as an approach to these sorts of issues to develop a curriculum and pedagogy policy. This can consist of a one- or two-page document that sets forth the Program's vision of best practices and basic means of implementing them.

**Recommendation D10:** Consider developing a curriculum and pedagogy policy addressing such issues as principles for new course proposals, determination of courses offered, and timely feedback regarding student work.

#### **4. Program working practices**

The correlative section of the Self-study (pp. 19-20) focuses on the issue of voicing, addressing specifically the problem "of teachers using voice in language classes that are supposed to be taught voice off" and the far-reaching effects with regard to audism. The Self-study raises questions; for example, "whether it is appropriate to remove the need for voicing interpreters in DEAF 161, Deaf History, and Deaf Culture & Community" (p. 23). Dr. Rowley makes clear in her report that she favors less by way of interpreting in classes. In concert with this perspective, she makes two recommendations relating to ensuring ASL proficiency:

- For issues regarding ASL instruction proficiency, encourage teachers to apply for ASLTA certification. College can support this by supporting faculty/staff who receive certification.

- For issues related to ASL faculty/staff signing proficiency, using an ASLPI score that is expected of skilled signers is reasonable. ASLTA certification required an ASLPI score of 3+ for certified level and 4 for Master level.

(The current cost for ASLTA certification are cited on the website of the American Sign Language Teachers Association, <https://asлта.org/certification/certification-evaluation-fees/>, and, for the ASLPI, on the website of Gallaudet University, <https://www.gallaudet.edu/the-american-sign-language-proficiency-interview/aslpi/aslpi-fees.>)

Development of a policy regarding language or communication would seem to be a pragmatic approach. Faculty in the Program could share perspectives and concerns while working toward agreement as how best to facilitate student learning, including not only language instruction but also the more far-reaching effects of voicing on Deaf culture.

**Recommendation D11:** Develop a language or communication policy to ensure optimal facilitation of student learning.

### **5. Educational effectiveness and faculty access to communication**

This section of the Self-study (pp. 20-21) continues addressing the problem of audism. Dr. Rowley devotes considerable attention in her report to this problem (see especially pp. 3-4). Indeed, many aspects of this program review make clear that audism—simply put, “oppression against Deaf people” (Lissa Stapleton, “The Disabled Academy: The Experiences of Deaf Faculty at Predominantly Hearing Institutions,” *NEA Higher Education Journal*, Winter [2015]: 56) is pervasive on the Sacramento State campus. There are many opportunities in most facets of professional life that hearing faculty and administrators simply take for granted that pose significant, possibly even insurmountable, challenges for Deaf persons. We are very fortunate as a campus community to have a thriving Deaf culture and an outstanding ASLDS faculty. It is imperative that we as a community do all that we can to confront audism and to make our professional lives as good as possible for all of us. This would include ensuring accommodations to enable full participation in campus events and professional opportunities and doing whatever possible to increase awareness and sensitivity. One specific step, as called for in the Self-study (p. 21), would be to secure a full-time, staff interpreter. This could significantly improve the quality and the scope of professional and personal interactions among our faculty.

**Recommendation C5/P3:** Take appropriate steps to confront audism and to help Deaf culture thrive on our campus; for example, consider securing a full-time, staff interpreter.

### **RECOMMENDATION TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

Based on this program review, the Self-study report prepared by the American Sign Language and Deaf Studies program, and the external consultant’s report, the Review Team recommends that the degree programs in American Sign Language and Deaf Studies be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

## APPENDIX: ASSESSMENT TABLES

### *American Sign Language & Deaf Studies: Comprehensive Assessment Plan*

<i>a</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>k</i>
<i>ILOs</i>	<i>PLOs</i>	<i>SLOs</i>	<i>Course where each SLO is assessed</i>	<i>Assessment activity/ assignment used to measure each SLO</i>	<i>Assessment tool used to measure outcome success</i>	<i>Assessment schedule – how often SLOs will be assessed</i>	<i>How data/ findings will be quantitatively or qualitatively reported</i>	<i>Designated personnel to collect, analyze, and interpret student learning outcome data</i>	<i>Program data/ findings dissemination schedule</i>	<i>Closing the loop strategies</i>
Intellectual and Practical Skills; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 1: Demonstrate the ability to communicate in American Sign Language with Deaf people.	=PLO	51, 52, 53, 154, 155	Signature assignments for each level are under development (Summer 2018)	Course grades	Every other year	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Years 1, 3, 5	Course standardization; increasing hours of exposure/practice
Personal and Social Responsibility; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 2: Identify major features and issues in the Deaf community and culture.	=PLO	60, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166	Written assignments including quizzes and exams, short reaction papers, essays and research papers	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 1	Eliminating the need for an interpreter
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 3: Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of power, privilege and oppression on Deaf people's experiences and reports of prejudice, discrimination, and inequity.	=PLO	60, 161, 162, 166	Written assignments including short reaction papers, essays, and research papers	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 2	Eliminating the need for an interpreter
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 4: Demonstrate an understanding of how the study of Deaf Studies enables individuals to make informed judgments aimed at strengthening the Deaf community.	=PLO	60, 165	Written assignments including short reaction papers and/or quizzes	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 2	

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World	PLO 5: Demonstrate an appreciation of the contributions of Deaf people to the arts, humanities, sciences, and other aspects of daily life in the form of "Deaf Gain".	=PLO	162, 165	Exam questions, presentations, essays and short reaction papers	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 3	
Personal and Social Responsibility	PLO 6: Describe and explain how communication between Hearing and Deaf people is to the benefit of society as a whole.	=PLO	60, 163	Reaction and research papers and assignments, as well as performance projects	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 4	
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 7: Critically analyze how the sociocultural history of Deaf people as individuals and as a community affect Deaf people's sense of self and relationship to others as individuals and as a community as a whole.	=PLO	161, 162, 165, 166	Examinations and research papers/assignments	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 4	Eliminating the need for an interpreter
Intellectual and Practical Skills; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 8: Critically reflect on one's abilities to interact with Deaf individuals on the social and professional levels and to evaluate the level of integration achieved.	=PLO	154, 155, 165, 166	Self-reflective exercises, class discussion, and reflection papers	Course grades	Once every five years	Course grades	Program Coordinator	Year 5	Course standardization; increasing hours of exposure/practice



***American Sign Language & Deaf Studies: Comprehensive Assessment Plan***

<i>ILO</i>	<i>PLO</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Student activity/ assignment</i>	<i>Assessment Method</i>	<i>Closing the loop strategies</i>
Intellectual and Practical Skills; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 1: Demonstrate the ability to communicate in American Sign Language with Deaf people.	DEAF 53: American Sign Language 3	Signature assignment: Student produces an Autobiographical video in ASL.	Faculty apply rubric to a random sample of videos to assess expressive language competence.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Personal and Social Responsibility; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 2: Identify major features and issues in the Deaf community and culture.	DEAF 162: Deaf Culture and Community	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students' identification and analysis of cultural issues.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 3: Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of power, privilege and oppression on Deaf people's experiences and reports of prejudice, discrimination, and inequity.	DEAF 166: Experience in the Deaf Community	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students' understanding of the effects of privilege, power and oppression on Deaf persons' experiences.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 4: Demonstrate an understanding of how the study of Deaf Studies enables individuals to make informed judgments aimed at strengthening the Deaf community.	DEAF 162: Deaf Culture and Community	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students' understanding of the value of Deaf Studies for strengthening the Deaf Community	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World	PLO 5: Demonstrate an appreciation of the contributions of Deaf people to the arts, humanities, sciences, and other aspects of daily life in the form of “Deaf Gain”.	DEAF 162: Deaf Culture and Community	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students’ understanding of the value of Deaf persons’ cultural and scientific contributions.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Personal and Social Responsibility	PLO 6: Describe and explain how communication between Hearing and Deaf people is to the benefit of society as a whole.	DEAF 166: Experience in the Deaf Community	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students’ understanding of the societal benefit of communication between Hearing and Deaf people.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Personal and Social Responsibility; Integrative Learning	PLO 7: Critically analyze how the sociocultural history of Deaf people as individuals and as a community affect Deaf people’s sense of self and relationship to others as individuals and as a community as a whole.	DEAF 161: Deaf History	Research Project	Faculty apply rubric to assess students’ ability to critically analyze historical factors contributing to Deaf persons’ sense of self and community.	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.
Intellectual and Practical Skills; Competence in the Disciplines	PLO 8: Critically reflect on one’s abilities to interact with Deaf individuals on the social and professional levels and to evaluate the level of integration achieved.	DEAF 155: American Sign Language 5	Embedded test items, randomly sampled discussion board posts, and/or projects/presentations	1) Exam item scores evaluate students’ ability to communicate in professional settings 2) Faculty apply rubric to assess students’ interactions in these settings (projects/posts)	Annual results will be analyzed by the program coordinator, and presented to faculty in fall retreat to develop strategies to adjust curriculum; address time to degree issues; craft budget proposals; plan for facilities; and work pertinent information into other program, school, and campus planning conversations.

**CSUS American Sign Language & Deaf Studies: Curriculum Map Matrix**

	DEAF 51: ASL 1	DEAF 52: ASL 2	DEAF 53: ASL 3	DEAF 154: ASL 4	DEAF 155: ASL 5	DEAF 60: Intro. to Deaf Studies	DEAF 161: Deaf History & Communi ty	DEAF 162: Deaf Culture & Communi ty	DEAF 163: ASL Literatur e	DEAF 165: Seminar: Current Issues	DEAF 166: Fieldwor k in Deaf Communi ty
<i>SLO 1:</i> Demonstrate the ability to communicate in American Sign Language with Deaf people.	I	I	D	D	M				M	M	M
<i>SLO 2:</i> Identify major features and issues in the Deaf community and culture.	I	I	D	D	M	I	D	D	D	M	M
<i>SLO 3:</i> Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of power, privilege and oppression on Deaf people's experiences and reports of prejudice, discrimination, and inequity.	I	I	D	D	D	I	D	D	D	M	M
<i>SLO 4:</i> Demonstrate an understanding of how the study of Deaf Studies enables individuals to make informed judgments aimed at strengthening the Deaf community.	I	I	D	D	D	I	D	D	D	M	M
<i>SLO 5:</i> Demonstrate an appreciation of the contributions of Deaf people to the arts, humanities, sciences, and other aspects of daily life in the form of "Deaf Gain".	I	I	D	D	D	I	D	D	M	M	M
<i>SLO 6:</i> Describe and explain how communication between Hearing and Deaf people is to the benefit of society as a whole.	I	I	I	D	D	I	D	D	M	M	M
<i>SLO 7:</i> Critically analyze how the sociocultural history of Deaf people as individuals and as a community affect Deaf people's sense of self and relationship to others as individuals and as a community as a whole.	I	I	I	D	D	I	I	D	M	M	M

<i>SLO 8:</i> Critically reflect on one's abilities to interact with Deaf individuals on the social and professional levels and to evaluate the level of integration achieved.	I	I	D	D	M	I	D	D	D	M	M
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---