2013-2014 ANNUAL DEAF STUDIES ASSESSMENT REPORT

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report;* Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline)*.

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes"; 2) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; 3) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; and 4) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews".

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: Deaf Studies

B2. Report author(s): William Vicars / Jennifer Rayman

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 73

B4. Program type: Undergraduate baccalaureate major

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**?
(See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details).
[**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [*]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
X	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
X	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were **assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:** a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

This year in order to move toward a better assessment of "program" learning objectives (and not simply classroom-based testing " we focused on assessing "overall competencies in the "Deaf Studies program" and how we are doing as far as providing our graduates a solid "foundation and skills for lifelong learning." The Deaf Studies faculty developed and administered (during Spring 2014) a student survey (See Appendix B) to program graduates to assess to what extent our overall program objectives are being realized. There were 9 items in the survey including items that asked students to reflect on how their degree has helped them achieve their goals post graduation, these questions helped us to evaluate the persistence of achievement in certain learning outcomes with in the Deaf Studies program assessment plan (see Appendix A). The goal of the survey was to provide a broader instrument that would touch upon multiple learning

outcomes to supplement our individual assessments for each outcome. The survey was initially designed to help us see primarily what our students are doing post graduation. This survey will be redesigned in the future to include more self-evaluation of achievement of PLOs. Since the use of American Sign Language is such a huge and important part of our major it was natural for us to assess the signing proficiency of our students. Signing proficiency is generally analogous to "oral communication" – just via the hands instead of the mouth. Additionally we began an initiative to assess "Intercultural knowledge and competency" – particularly as part of our "American Sign Language 2" course. Specifically we decided that the grading for each ASL 2 course in our program should contain a weight of 15% or more toward the overall grade based on "Deaf Culture."

Based on feedback received the Spring of 2013 from our previous annual report we also examined student achievement at or near graduation for two more PLOs: Civic Engagement and PLO #6 The importance of communication between Deaf and hearing people. PLO # 6: Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society.

For Program learning outcome 6, "Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society," Deaf studies students will demonstrate the value of communication cross-culturally in order to create relationships that promote the liberation of Deaf people from language and disability/identity oppression, advocating the human and language rights of Deaf people.

We piloted using the following criteria for the learning outcome on a rating scale of 1 as benchmark to 4 as capstone level achievement of the concept):
  6.1: Identify a range of different modes of communication between Deaf and Hearing people
  6.2: Evaluate different characteristics of effective communication between Deaf and hearing people
      from the perspective of an ally to the ASL Deaf community.
  6.3: Explain the significance of respect for Deaf people's language and interaction preferences as a
      key feature of communication practices.
  6.4: Explain the implications of lack of access of communication between Deaf and hearing people

In addition, we determined to examine the Civic Engagement VALUE rubric as it applies to our students. In order to help us with backwards design and improve our capstone course DEAF 166 Experiences in the Deaf community.
  1. Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity (**Diversity of Cultures and Communities**)

  2. Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/ field/ discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. (**Analysis of Knowledge)**

  3. Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/ he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action. (**Civic Identity and Commitment)**

  4. Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action. (**Civic Communication)**

5. Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions. (**Civic Action and Reflection**)

6. Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim (**Civic Contexts and Structures**)

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (**If no, go to Q1.4**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q1.4**)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP)[*] to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

[*] **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:
http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **ALL** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2**)
	4. Don't know (**Go to Q2.2**)
	5. Not Applicable (**Go to Q2.2**)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014

Of the six PLO's we focused on this year ("Oral communication," "Intercultural knowledge and competency," "Foundations and skills for lifelong learning," and "Overall competencies in the major/discipline" Civic Engagement and PLO 6 The importance of communication between Deaf and Hearing people) we developed "explicit" standards of performance for the "Oral communication" PLO to pilot more widely in the future (which in our case was exhibited via our PLO of: "American Sign Language Proficiency").

PLO: Oral communication: "American Sign Language Proficiency"

Standard of performance expected at graduation:
Students is able to sign ASL with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics; can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for normal rate of signing; vocabulary is broad enough that it is rarely necessary to grope for a sign; "accent" may be obviously non-native but control of grammar is good and errors virtually never interfere with understanding.

For applicable rubrics see:
Appendix C: American Sign Language Public Presentation Rubric
Appendix D: American Sign Language Video Assignment Rubric
Appendix H: Signing Proficiency Rubric
Appendix F: ASL Linguistics: Rubric / Language Variance and Change
Appendix G: ASL Linguistics Rubric: Language Discourse and Norms

PLO: Intercultural knowledge and competency: "Knowledge of Deaf Culture"

Standard of performance expected at graduation: "Student is able to identify major features and issues in the Deaf Community and Deaf Culture including the enculturation process, diversity within, characteristics of, language usage, values, beliefs, behavioral norms, reliance on technology, literary and artistic traditions, history, prominent figures, institutions, and proper terminology."

Sample rubric: See: "Appendix E: Deaf Culture Research Paper Rubric." Note that rubric could likely be used to additionally assess a PLO for "Written communication" but we are choosing to categorize it as part of our assessment of "Intercultural knowledge and competency" at this time.

PLO: "Foundations and skills for lifelong learning" & "Overall competencies in the major/discipline:"

The assessment process for the PLO of "Foundations and skills for lifelong learning" traditionally centers on the topics of: "Curiosity, initiative, independence, transfer, and reflection." We realize that we are not there yet (in terms of adequately assessing either of those two PLO's) and so to

make progress we have been using a series of "Student Exit Surveys" to determine the extent to which the existing overall competencies developed by our graduates are indeed providing the students with foundations and skills for lifelong learning as determined by their responses to our surveys. Here is a rubric that tabulates some of the more quantifiable data

End Results Rubric:	Yes	No
Pursuing Interpreter training		
Pursuing related Masters degree		
Pursuing non-Deaf related degree		
Working as interpreters		
Working in Deaf education		
Working in other Deaf related fields		
Working in non-Deaf social service provision		
Working in non-Deaf field		
Now holds interpreting credentials		
Double Major		
Professional organization membership		

However that rubric was not the focus of this assessment. Rather we feel the more valuable data was gathered from open ended questions such as:

"What kind of work do you do?"
"In what ways did your Deaf Studies degree prepare you?"
"What would you recommend to improve the B.A. degree?"

Such questions and more were part of online surveys conducted via "Survey Monkey" and/or Blackboard over the past 5 years. For the exact questions used in the current 2014 Survey as well as a sample from a previous survey (2011) see: "Appendix B: Exit Surveys."

PLO: "Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society,"

For Program learning outcome 6, Deaf studies students will demonstrate the value of communication cross-culturally in order to create relationships that promote the liberation of Deaf people from language and disability/identity oppression, advocating the human and language rights of Deaf people: they will

We piloted using the following criteria for the learning outcome on a rating scale of 1 as benchmark to 4 as capstone level achievement of the concept):
    6.1: Identify a range of different modes of communication between Deaf and Hearing people
    6.2: Evaluate different characteristics of effective communication between Deaf and hearing
        people from the perspective of an ally to the ASL Deaf community.
    6.3: Explain the significance of respect for Deaf people's language and interaction
        preferences as a key feature of communication practices.
    6.4: Explain the implications of lack of access of communication between Deaf and hearing
        people

PLO: "Civic Engagement"

In addition, we determined to examine the Civic Engagement VALUE rubric as it applies to our students.

In order to help us with backwards design and improve our capstone course DEAF 166 Experiences in the Deaf community. In each category following the value rubric students were **a rated on a 4 point scale --1 as benchmark to 4 as capstone level achievement of the concept**)

1. Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity (**Diversity of Cultures and Communities**)

2. Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/ field/ discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. (**Analysis of Knowledge)**

3. Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/ he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action. **(Civic Identity and Commitment)**

4. Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action. (**Civic Communication)**

5. Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions. (**Civic Action and Reflection)**

6. Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim (**Civic Contexts and Structures)**

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014**?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q3.1)**

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In **SOME course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In **ALL course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for** EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Data for PLO: Oral communication: "American Sign Language Proficiency"

The first table below shows a series of testing results for "oral communication" skills (American Sign Language Proficiency) as demonstrated throughout the Deaf Studies Program's "American Sign Language 4" course. The two tables following that show results from testing conducted as part of our "American Sign Language Structure and Usage" course in which we teach ASL linguistics and grammar. It is important to understand that these tables represent not just three but rather 16 separate assessments. Thus we have a good indication of our major students' performance in the area of "sign language proficiency." See below the tables for a discussion of our results, findings, and conclusions:

2014 Assessment Statistics	American Sign Language Level 4	
Sign Language Proficiency Assessment		
Number of participants: 32		
Test	Average	Median
Exam-01	81.00	84.00
Exam-02	76.52	75.00
Exam-03	258.06	276.00
Quiz-01	17.20	20.00
Quiz-02	18.70	19.00
Quiz-03	15.06	16.00
Quiz-04	17.77	18.00
Quiz-05	18.10	19.00
Quiz-06	17.41	17.50
Quiz-07	17.21	18.66
Quiz-08	17.37	18.00
Quiz-09	16.30	18.00
Quiz-10	18.67	19.00
Final Exam	270.22	282.00

2014 Assessment Statistics	ASL Linguistics Rubric / Language Variance and Change
Count	31
Minimum Value	5.00
Maximum Value	10.00
Range	5.00
Average	9.19
Median	10.00
Standard Deviation	1.15
Variance	1.32
When and where assessed	Fall 2013 as part of the DEAF 164 course.
Assessed by	William Vicars
Audience	All Deaf Studies Majors

2014 Assessment Statistics	ASL Linguistics Rubric / Language Discourse and Norms
Count	29
Minimum Value	5.00
Maximum Value	10.00
Range	5.00
Average	9.31
Median	10.00
Standard Deviation	1.09
Variance	1.18
When and where assessed	Fall 2013 as part of the DEAF 164 course.
Assessed by	William Vicars
Audience	All Deaf Studies Majors

Results, findings, and conclusions:
Our classes are "full" as evidenced by the fact that we are averaging 31 students per class. Something the "stats" do not show is that more people wanted into these classes than was feasible to teach. This would lead us to conclude that perhaps a program expansion is in order. The "range" shown in two of the tables indicates a range of 50% (5 away from 10) which means that at least one student is struggling but the standard deviation of 1.09 and 1.15 as well as the average score of over 90% correct on the linguistics-related quizzes indicates that by and large the students are achieving a high level of understanding of the tested concepts. However the linguistics testing focused more on a theoretical understanding of the concepts involved in "sign language proficiency" whereas the "American Sign Language 4" class assessments consisted entirely of actual language proficiency testing of which the assessment labeled as Exam 3 (due to the timing and content of the exam) is the best overall indicator of student proficiency levels. On this assessment students averaged 258 points out of 300 which translates to 86 percent which is considered "good" performance.
==

Data for PLO: Intercultural knowledge and competency

2014 Assessment Statistics	American Sign Language Culture
Count	20
Minimum Value	27.50
Maximum Value	50.00
Range	23.00
Average	44.50
Median	45.00
When assessed	Spring 2014

Audience	Students in DEAF 52 "ASL 2"

Summary, findings, and conclusions:
The data and findings indicate that students are indeed developing an understanding of Deaf culture. While there is a large range in the assessment results the average result was 89% which was very good.

===
Data for PLO: Foundations and skills for lifelong learning:
We did not gather data separate for this PLO but rather it was combined with our "Overall competencies in the major/discipline" data below.

===
Data for PLO: Overall competencies in the major/discipline

In the Spring of 2014, we conducted a survey of former graduates reaching out through social networking, we gained a response of 39 former graduates. This constitutes about 36% of our former students who completed our capstone course since it was first offered (approximately 117 students). We qualitatively reviewed their responses to questions relating to how their Deaf Studies Degree matters in the context of their current job and how their Deaf Studies Degree prepared them. Though an imperfect measure for evaluating the impact of our learning outcomes on our graduates, as the questions are open ended yet it does reveal what was most salient about our program as they applied it to their current situations. Among the respondents 64% (25) directly mentioned our first program learning outcome of competence in ASL communication skills and 69% (27) mentioned competence in Deaf cultural knowledge. 15% directly mentioned issues of power and privilege. Indirectly, students also mentioned ideas relating to the importance of communication between Deaf and hearing people.

Students made comments such as:

> "My degree gave me a cultural understanding that makes my job easier and helps me to work more effectively and with more cultural sensitivity"

> "It has given me a better understanding of the Deaf Community and how to interact with the Deaf Community as a future healthcare provider and/or public health educator."

> "I have a greater understanding and appreciation of Deaf Culture. I stand up for injustice and ignorance where I see it occurring and try to educate others on how to make things more accessible to Deaf patrons."

> "it helped me spot out discrimination and privilege in all aspects of life"

Approximately a quarter of respondents are currently pursuing further education while the remaining three quarters are pursuing careers. Currently 26% (11 students) are pursuing further education. Among those the majority (8) are pursing fields related to Deaf studies primarily in Interpreter Training programs with one pursing a master's degree in sign linguistics.

Currently pursuing further education n=11

Pursuing Interpreter training	7
Pursuing related Masters degree	1
Pursuing non-Deaf related degree	3

Among those in careers, 38% (15) are working in Deaf related fields: interpreting (5), Deaf education (6), other Deaf related paraprofessionals (4) while 15% (6) are working in tangential fields utilizing skills related to their degree, such as a group home for boys or as a support worker for individuals with disabilities, or as a child care worker using knowledge gained in Deaf studies. Among our graduates, 18% (7) are working in unrelated fields such as running a transportation business, an agriculture technician or insurance claims specialist. However some of these mention using their skills with deaf clients and coworkers.

Currently in careers n=28

Working as interpreters	5
Working in Deaf education	6
Working in other Deaf related fields	4
Working in non-Deaf social service provision	6
Working in non-Deaf field	7

Conclusion: The most common pursuit after graduation is to become a certified interpreter. About 30% (12) of the respondents are either working interpreters or in training to become interpreters.

Data for PLO: "Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society,"

A sample of 10 randomly selected final reports for our core course DEAF 166 were evaluated using the criteria piloted. Further evaluation of this PLO across a variety of assessments is needed to get a more complete picture of how our students are achieving in this area.

The importance of Deaf /Hearing Communication

Different Levels / Four Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Total (N=10)
1: Identify variety of modes of communication	40%	50%		10%			2.9 (100%, N=10)
2: Evaluate effective communication	50%	40%	10%				3 (100%, N=10)

3: Respect for Deaf people	10%	80%		10%			3.2 (100%, N=10)
4: Implications for the lack of access to communication		30%	20%	50%			3.2 (100%, N=10)

Based on this initial evaluation the majority of students are achieving milestone 3 and above. However this assessment may not be accurate as the report itself did not directly elicit all aspects of the PLO. Students conducted independent service projects that may or may not have involved different modes of communication or a necessary element for evaluating effective communication or the implications for a lack of communication. After evaluating this data it is clear that our faculty will need to revisit this learning outcome and determine our goals for what standards of achievement are acceptable for competency at or near graduation. In addition we need to examine the curriculum more globally to map where elements of this PLO are being evidenced.

===

Data for PLO: Civic Engagement
Currently, the main course that involves direct civic engagement is DEAF 166 Experiences in the Deaf community. All of our graduating seniors take this course the semester before they graduate thus it is a good gauge of student achievement at or near graduation. We began to explore applying the VALUE rubric for Civic Engagement to DEAF 166 course, This proved to be a valuable exercise indicating the need for revision of the structure of assessments used in DEAF 166.

A sample of 10 randomly selected final reports out of 35 student were evaluated using the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric. See Appendix J.

The Results for Civic Engagement

Different Levels ⟍ Six Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Total (N=10)
1: Diversity of Communities and cultures	**40%**	50%		10%			**3.35** (100%, N=10)
2: Analysis of knowledge	**50%**	40%	10%				**3.45** (100%, N=10)
3: Civic Identity and Commitment	**10%**	80%		10%			**3** (100%, N=10)
4: Civic Communication		30%	20%	50%			**2.45** (100%, N=10)
5: Civic action and reflection	**20%**	20%	30%	30%			**2.75** (100%, N=10)
6: Civic contexts and structures		40%	50%	10%			**2.7** (100%, N=10

This course has been problematic over the course of its lifetime as we transitioned from a small fieldwork class of 12- 15 to a larger lecture class in order to meet the needs of our growing student population. However, with 35 students enrolled, individual service learning projects developed in the space of one semester may need to be rethought. Many of our students do not have deep connections in the Deaf community to be able to conduct a significant short-term project in collaboration with the Deaf community. The projects and assignments need significant overhaul to more directly address the criteria within the VALUE rubric with an eye towards incorporating civic engagement more fully across the curriculum prior to this course and assisting students in developing a range of skills needed for deeper civic engagement in the Deaf community.

Based on the standards and criteria from 1 to 5 in the Civic Engagement rubric the majority of the students had not engaged or reflected at a high level. A number of students reported on the process of creating their project and the outcomes of the project but did not engage in deeper analysis extending knowledge or reflecting on the aims and accomplishments of their projects. The limitation of the time frame during the semester poses significant challenge to students' ability to conduct civic action and reflection that demonstrates initiative and team leadership of complex or multiple activities. In order to more fully evaluate this learning outcome with more time we will need to take a sampling of a range of different assessments which touch on the different aspects of the VALUE rubric.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Oral Communication]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

***

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: **Intercultural knowledge and competency:** "Knowledge of Deaf Culture"

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Third PLO: **Data for PLO:** Foundations and skills for lifelong learning:

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
X	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Forth PLO: Overall competencies in the major/discipline

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set

	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program **assess in the 2013-2014 academic year**? [__4__]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO **in 2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures
Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q4.4**)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based

	projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) **[key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)]** that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

In ASL 4 the direct measures were Quizzes 1 – 10, Exams 1, 2, and 3, and the Final Exam. These included five one-on-one interviews with each student wherein they communicated to the tester in American Sign Language. Such exams are commonly labeled as "expressive exams." The other 9 exams in this series were group exams wherein the instructor signed to the class and the class wrote down what the instructor was signing. Such exams are labeled as "receptive exams." Thus the students received both receptive and expressive testing in the target language.

In DEAF 164, "ASL Structure and Usage" the direct measures were Quizzes 22 and 23. These quizzes tested the students knowledge of the grammar and usage rules pertaining to the target language.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion**?**

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? **[Select one only]**

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only]**

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
X	4. Use other means. Specify: Rubric adapted from Alice Omaggio and Gallaudet University.

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We tested whole classes of students.

Indirect Measures
Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.5)**

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.6)**

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(Go to Q4.7)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.7)**

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

In DEAF 164 "American Sign Language Structure and Usage" the data was collected via online testing using the "SacCT" (Blackboard system) using multiple choice testing. This same data has been collected for three years now using three different groups of students and is very consistent. Most of students in this class have completed 4 semesters of ASL and are in their penultimate semester before graduation. Thus they are nearing graduation status.

In DEAF 154 "American Sign Language 4" the data was collected via two methods:
1. One-on-one interviews
2. Group testing.
The one-on-one interviews occurred 5 separate times. Each student was interviewed five separate times. Each proceeding interview included (at random) previous material (they were "comprehensive"). There were 32 students in the class thus approximately 150 interviews took place over a period of 3 months. The results of the five one-on-one testing sessions were consistent with the results of the nine group (receptive language) testing sessions which would seem to indicate that the data is reliable and valid.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 16.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum			x		
3. Improving advising and mentoring		x			
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			x		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			x		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan		x			
7. Annual assessment reports			x		
8. Program review			x		
9. Prospective student and family information			x		
10. Alumni communication		x			
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)			x		
12. Program accreditation				x	
13. External accountability reporting requirement				x	
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations				x	
15. Strategic planning			x		
16. Institutional benchmarking				x	
17. Academic policy development or modification			x		
18. Institutional Improvement				x	
19. Resource allocation and budgeting			x		
20. New faculty hiring				x	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			x		
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

The assessment data has had its strongest impact in terms of how we advise and interact with our students. The exit interviews we conduct have helped inform us regarding what the students value regarding their experiences here. Particularly of interest (and impact) to us is the data from our alumni who respond to our exit questionnaires regarding where they are now and how they are using (or not using) the information we taught them. It has become clear to us that our degree is, to a large extent, a stepping stone or gateway to either interpreting or Deaf education – both of which will require training beyond what we provide. This means that equipping our students with "foundations and skills for lifelong learning" needs to be one of our top goals. This in turn has influenced our teaching approaches (more student teamwork," "more projects with real world applications,") as well as causing us to seek more opportunities to collaborate with community organizations and other colleges.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q5.3)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q5.3)**

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

We receive many transfer students who have completed many of the PLO's already and thus are re-sitting courses to receive CSUS credit. Eventually we anticipate adding more classes and requiring completion of ASL 1 through 4 prior to entering the Deaf Studies major. Some of the new classes perhaps do not have to actually be "new" classes but could be existing courses in other Departments that are directly related to our major. This will require collaborating more with other Departments as well as engaging in the course proposal and approval process.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to **assess**

	but not included above:
	a.
	b.
	c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
X	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **developed** a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
X	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes (See Appendix I)
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class:

DEAF 166

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: Deaf Studies Program

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Division of Undergraduate Studies

A9. Department Chair's Name: Dr. Ana Garcia-Nevarez

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: 1

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
X	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):
A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 2
A12.1. List all the name(s):
Bachelor of Arts – American Sign Language/Deaf Studies
Minor – American Sign Language/Deaf Studies

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? None

Master Degree Program(s):
A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 0
A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____]
A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [_____]

Credential Program(s):
A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 0
A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

Doctorate Program(s)
A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

Appendix A:

Deaf Studies Program Assessment Plan
Program goals and learning outcomes (PLO's):
What should Deaf Studies students know, value, and be able to do at the time of graduation?

These program learning outcomes were published first in our assessment report for 2011, since that time it has become clear that it is time to seriously revisit our PLOs especially with an eye towards examining the Sac State baccalaureate learning outcomes. We will need to look at signature assignments for our core classes and remap learning outcomes with various assessments throughout the curriculum. We need to examine current evaluation practices and develop common rubrics that will function across the curriculum in order to examine our learning outcomes more globally .

Program Learning Outcomes	Assessment methods
1. Demonstrate the ability to communicate in American Sign Language with Deaf people.	Tested repeatedly throughout the program in numerous ways but specifically tested in DEAF 51, DEAF 52, DEAF 53, DEAF 154, and DEAF 155. See the following rubrics for examples: Appendix C: American Sign Language Public Presentation Rubric Appendix D: American Sign Language Video Assignment Rubric Appendix H: Signing Proficiency Exam Rubric
2. Identify major features and issues in the Deaf Community and Deaf Culture.	This is developed throughout the curriculum particularly DEAF 60, 161,162, 163, 165, 166. This is assessed through a variety of written assessments including short reaction papers, essays and research papers.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of power, privilege, and oppression on the Deaf Community that result in Deaf people's experience of prejudice, discrimination, and inequity.	This is developed throughout the curriculum particularly DEAF 161,162, 166. This is assessed through a variety of written assessments including short reaction papers, essays and research papers.
4. Demonstrate and understanding of how the study of Deaf Studies enables individuals to make informed judgments that strengthen the Deaf Community.	
5. Demonstrate an appreciation of the contributions of Deaf people to the arts and humanities.	This is developed in DEAF 162 and DEAF 163 and assessed through exam questions, presentations, essays and short reaction papers. Expanded criteria for this PLO need to be developed and applied across the curriculum
6. Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society.	An expanded criteria for this learning out come was developed and data collect for a particular capstone assignment. These criteria need further evaluation

7. Analyze critically how a Deaf person's socio-cultural history affects one's sense of self and relationship to others.	This is developed in DEAF 161 Deaf history and touched on throughout the curriculum in DEAF 162, 165, 166
8. Reflect critically on one's abilities to interact with Deaf individuals socially and professionally, and evaluate the level of integration achieved.	This is developed particularly in our upper level ASL skills courses DEAF 154 and 155 as well as in DEAF 165, 166. This is conducted primarily through self reflective exercises both in class discussion and reflection papers.

Appendix B: Exit Survey

===

2014 CSUS Deaf Studies Student Exit Survey Questions:

1. When did you graduate from CSUS?*Required

2. Did you graduate with a double major? If so, what is the other one?*Required

3. Did you have a minor? If so, what was your minor?

4. Did you further your education after you graduated? If so, where did you go? What was your field and program (IPP, Teaching Credential, Master's degree etc.)?*Required

5. What is your current job and position? What do you do? Explain how your Deaf Studies degree matters in this context?*Required

6. In what ways did your Deaf Studies degree prepare you? And what would you recommend to improve the B.A. degree?*Required

7. Do your goals for your future involve working with the Deaf Community? Explain.*Require

8. Outside of work, do you currently interact with the Deaf Community in any way? Describe.*Required

9. May we have your Name? And email, phone number to follow up with you in the future?

[END OF 2014 EXIT SURVEY]

CSUS Deaf Studies Student Feedback Survey From 2011

1. Graduation Date: Fall 2010 / Spring 2011

2. What type of student were you when you started at CSUS?
 Transfer from community college = 7 students = 58.3%
 Started as a first year at CSUS = 5 students = 41.7%

3. How many semesters of ASL had you completed when you decided to major in Deaf Studies?
 None = 23.1% = 3 students
 1 semester of ASL =15.4%= 2 students
 2 semesters of ASL = 15.4% = 2 students
 3 semesters of ASL = 23.1% = 3 students
 4 semesters of ASL = 0
 5 semesters of ASL = 23.1% = 3 students

4. What motivated you to major in Deaf Studies?
1. There was not a deaf studies major available when I first got to CSUS. once it became a major I was immediately drawn to it after attending my g/f's ASL1 class. been in the major ever since.
2. My ASL 1 teacher was friendly and encouraging and I really enjoyed learning the language. When I got to CSUS, my teachers blew my mind with their passion and support, and they really captivated me.
3. I had initially been pursuing a career in teaching so I felt that the language and culture knowledge would give me an "edge" in competing in the teaching field. I also was intrigued on seeing the world from a different perspective.
4. When I realized I really loved the language and didn't want to stop even though I had taken all the ASL classes. I also spoke with Dr Egbert and she strongly encouraged me to look into it as a possible major.
5. The language. I absolutely love ASL. I knew I needed to learn more, hopefully become fluent and learn more about Deaf Culture. I knew that if I loved the language I needed to know the background on it. My love just progressed from there.
6. The language was a major aspect. After majoring in Deaf Studies the culture and people played another big role in continuing with the major.
7. I went to an elementary school that had Deaf students in it. I fell in love with the thought of interpreting such a beautiful language. From then on, I always knew I wanted to be a interpreter.
8. I always loved the language and when I started to learn about the culture I wanted to keep learning about it.
9. I grew up in a large Deaf Community and have had many Deaf friends growing up. I was very involved in the Community but did not know why certain things were "Cultural norms" so I became a Deaf Studies major to learn more about that Community.
10. Course work and opportunities for work.
11. The love of languages in general, and also a love for ASL.
12. I fell in love with the language and the more I studied the more I liked the courses.
13. I fell in love with the language and then took some other culture classes and became hooked. I decided this is what I want to be a part of.
 .
5. What did you like most about your experience in the Deaf Studies Program? What are the strengths of the program?
1. Networking with all the teachers who truly cared about the students. Learning new vocabulary, meeting people in the deaf community, and meeting peers. volunteer, tutoring, and interpreting.
2. The program really went into depth about the people and the culture in addition to just learning a language. I feel that language majors generally just focus on the language itself, rather than the culture, and I love that this major is not like that.
3. I loved learning the language and getting to meet Deaf professionals. The strengths are professors who are educated in their field.
4. I have learned an extraordinary amount about a culture that when I started I knew very little about. The teachers are all extremely helpful and truly want us to succeed. They each support us in everything that we are doing and having that kind of support is necessary when thinking about higher education. Having people behind you constantly reassuring you that you CAN do this is crucial.
5. I loved the classes that were offered that all somewhat overlapped but still brought new ideas to different topics. I did especially LOVE the one-on-one aspect I was able to have with the professors. They are so willing to help, share and motivate you to do your absolute best. I have not had any teachers on campus as dedicated to their students as I have in the Deaf Studies Program.
6. What I enjoyed most about my experience is the people! Both the students and the professors are amazing!! The strength behind the program is, it has professor that know what they are talking about and are very knowledgeable. They go our of there way to make sure you succeed.
7. I think the strength of the program is that it is small and that the students truly feel supported by the staff. I only had one instance where I was turned away when I had a question. I felt there is a genuine desire for the students to succeed. The professors actually CARE! Wow! That is a crazy concept in a college class.
8. I loved the close community dynamics and the bonds we formed with each other, and I liked the close comfortable dynamic with the professors. In other programs there is a huge divide in the dynamics of professor and student, and in this program there isn't and professors always make you feel welcome.
9. The best thing about the Deaf Studies program is how well you get to know your Professor because of how small the ratio of students to teachers there are. The program itself as well as the Professors have a very collectivist appeal to it.
10. Access to the professors for assistance.
11. I most liked the language skills and knowledge that I gained and the people I met who shared support in my goals.
12. I really liked how close I became to other students. we had most of the same classes together so we really helped and supported each other.
13. I like being able to approach my professors and ask questions or have a discussion about everything we are learning. Some professors can be intimidating or stand offish but this department is pretty accommodating.

6. What would you like to see changed or improved in the Deaf Studies Program? What are the weaknesses of the program?

1. Repetition is a huge problem in the program. the classes should be far more diverse in the fields and areas it studies. I feel like each class is a mirror of itself. There was so little I learned in each class as I moved up because we had covered the same exact topics. Each book we had talked about audism, deafhood, and deaf community. I feel like we never left these topics.
2. I felt like most of the classes blended together because they all focused heavily on Deaf culture. I feel like some of the classes could have expanded on topics that are more significant to the specific class, rather than all connecting the content to culture, especially because one class is devoted to doing just that.
3. I strongly feel that there needs to be more language classes that don't necessarily focus solely on teaching from the textbook (Signing Naturally) but consider the benefit of having more interaction and conversational skills. I think some classes could be combined and still have the same effect, such as Deaf History and Deaf Culture. There has been too much repetition in what we have learned in classes. I want to say that we need more professors so we get more of a variety, but I know that's a hard request to make because of budget limitations.
4. Budget cuts were my personal issue and I know that can't be changed. Most of my struggles were a result of those.
5. I would like to see a little bit of expansion in some of the topics because we had to rush through some semesters because of the amount of content. I would have liked to have had 2 classes for Culture because of the amount of content. I also was disappointed for ASL 5 because it seemed like we did not improve in that class. Mainly we just reviewed a lot of signs but there was nothing to really help us increase our knowledge of ASL and that is your final class for learning it.
6. Things that I would like to see change is all the major classes should be in ASL. Other language departments teach in the language they are majoring in and I believe that should be the same for Deaf studies
7. We absolutely need more language classes. The last two semesters of the program have a large emphasis on the culture, which I believe is wonderful and should not be eliminated. However, students need more experience with signing. It does not necessarily have to be an ASL 6 or 7 based off of a textbook but instead just everyday life sorts of things.
8. would like to see more structure in some of the professor's courses. The weakness is that there needs to be more variety between the subjects of the program. There was such a major overlap of the course content it felt like we were taking the same course semester after semester just with different names and a slightly more in depth focus respectively.
9. The program itself is constantly changing. Sometimes it is difficult to remember which are old catalog rights and which are new. Sometimes the professors disagree with each other regarding them or the requirements.
10. More consistency and standards in classroom instruction.
11. A lot of the classes have overlapping content. Some teachers are challenging to work with.
12. I think the faculty needs to get more involved. there are one or two who are involved in the club and support students but others seem to teach and go home. they need to support the students if the students are to support their culture.
13. This might sound weird but I would like a couple more classes added. I feel like I could have taken another ASL class with more vocabulary and practice. Also to have the same teachers teaching the courses consistently rather than one semester Dr. Vicars teaches Linguistics and the next Dr. Grushkin. I think it makes them better teachers and the students get more out of it.

7. What specific suggestions do you have to improve the program?
1. diversify the classes. stop teaching the same info in each class. SIGN in all classes, there are way too many students in the higher level classes who cannot fully understand ASL. do not let those who are not fluent go further, make them work to become better so they can understand the content going forward. try and help students graduate instead of making it so difficult, so many students last semester had to petition tons of times to get what was fair. make us write papers on things that really matter and that we care about and that we can relate to. not just pick a topic in the deaf community and away you go.
2. I think that a little more prep on certain topics before the class dives deep into the subject would have helped me a lot. For instance, ASL Lit should have explained the basics of poetry (hearing and Deaf) before we began reading and discussing it. I may have learned about poetry back in grade school but that was a long time ago, so it was difficult for me to understand certain topics. ASL Linguistics was very similar. Had I not taken a linguistics class a few years back I feel that I would have been struggling to understand the class. I also think that the fingerspelling and numbers class could have been more interactive, because I know that is the area that I need most help with and I don't feel like we were really challenged in that class.
3. The combination of classes (like Culture and History) in order to provide more language classes. Bring in Deaf community members for interaction in ASL classes. Create different projects in the language classes, such as; having students conduct a class survey in ASL, give a short speech, give a short "how to" lesson, instead of the usual signing of a story.
4. One thing that I have had an issue with is hearing ASL teachers speaking in classes. It doesn't help prepare the students for the next class when their teacher might be Deaf and won't speak at all. All the ASL classes should be run similarly in that there is NO TALKING done by the teacher. Also reinforcing the department policy of no students talking in class unless specifically given the OK by their teacher. The ASL classes have had a lot of issues with that this semester and it's disrespectful to the teacher as well as the other students. Also I was told that certain classes had prereqs when in reality they didn't. I don't feel it is right for a teacher to make up prereqs for classes and not have it be legit. I was told on multiple occasions that I couldn't take one of the classes I wanted because I hadn't taken the "prereq" which didn't actually exist. This set me back and was extremely frustrating.
5. I also would have liked to have more information on becoming an interpreter. We had guest speakers but I wish there might have been a portion of lecture devoted to the different avenues you could potentially go into.
6. Maybe have more information about job opportunities. I know for me I want to continue working with Deaf people and signing.
7. Bring in Deaf people so the students can communicate with them! Add more language classes.
8. I think the professors need to work together to change the structure of the program, and to give it an actual solid structure.
9. I think the program is such a new major that it really just needs time to become a more solid study.
10. Agree upon curriculum and standardize for all teachers of each subject. Offer more flexibility for students who need certain classes to graduate.
11. as I said in number 6, teachers need to get more involved and supportive of the students.
12. Same in question number 6.

8. What topics would you have liked to have explored in more depth as a full seminar class?
1. new vocabulary, ASL interpreting, passing the NIC, Teaching, Education, parent education, more volunteering in the deaf community throughout the entire program.

2. I'm not sure. I really enjoyed focusing on Deaf Education and I think that that should actually be a class or should at least be a common seminar choice, because access to and lack of education is a big topic in the Deaf community. This topic was something that I was completely oblivious to, so I feel that there are probably other topics out there like that which would enrich the students.

3. Applying your Deaf Studies degree to the real-world/workplace and taking a broader approach, not just focusing on education or interpreting.

4. Personally I would have liked to learn more about Deaf Education. I tried to take that seminar class but was told that I couldn't. I also wanted to take the Deaf in the Media class but that was cancelled due to lack of enrollment.

5. I would have liked to learn more about Deaf Institutes. I know about them but we focused so much on how kids are forced into oralism and speech that I don't know the actual teaching methods in Deaf Institutes. I think that would have been very interesting to learn.

6. Deaf Education.

7. How to apply your major to the real world! Finding jobs, what jobs are out there, how can you get them, what do you need to do, what kind of obstacles will you face, tools to succeed, etc.

8. I would like to discuss more about the differences between the ethnicities within the Deaf culture, such as Hispanic American Deaf, Black Deaf, Asian American Deaf, etc.

9. How hearing people fit in in the Deaf community. I feel, this topic was covered briefly but there is such controversial as to where the line needs to be drawn as far as hearing people in the Deaf community.

10. I would like to have explored more about what kinds of jobs my Deaf Studies degree can be used in. It would be helpful to talk about that throughout the entire program rather than just at the end.

11. Deaf art would have been interesting. I think it would have been nice to have an into to interpreting class since a lot of students plan on becoming interpreters.

12. Deaf Art! That would be an interesting class, some classes touch on it but it would be interesting to get more into depth.

[END OF 2011 EXIT SURVEY]

Appendix C: (For possible use next year)

American Sign Language Public Presentation Rubric

Adapted from a rubric produced by the Gallaudet University Office of Bilingual Teaching and Learning -
- which was based on the Association of American Colleges and Universities' "Public presentation VALUE Rubric."

Definition
A Public presentation is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Purpose
Public presentation takes many forms. This rubric is specifically designed to evaluate public presentations of a single presenter at a time and is best applied to live or video-recorded presentations. For panel presentations or group presentations, it is recommended that each presenter be evaluated separately. This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization.

Glossary
The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.
- **Central message:** The main point/thesis/"bottom line"/"take-away" of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.
- **Organization:** The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting material in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the presentation, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.
- **Language Use:** Vocabulary, terminology, and ASL structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- **Delivery techniques:** Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of ASL. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the presenter stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her materials/notes, uses sign language expressively, and uses few language fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).
-

Supporting material: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that supports the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the presenter's credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the presenter as a credible Shakespearean actor.

American Sign Language Public Presentation Rubric

	4 (Exceptional)	3	2	1 (Developing)
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language Use	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery Techniques	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and visual expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and presenter appears polished and confident..	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and visual expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and presenter appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and visual expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and presenter appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and visual expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and presenter appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.

Appendix D: (For possible use next year)

American Sign Language Video Assignment Rubric

Adapted from a rubric developed by the Gallaudet University Office of Bilingual Teaching and Learning

Definition

An ASL Video Assignment is the development and expression of ideas in American Sign Language recorded through digital means. A video assignment involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different visual technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images.

Purpose

ASL Video Assignment are used to record a variety of academic work in American Sign Language and textualized through digital means. Types of assignments being developed depends on genre and disciplinary requirements of a course, major or program. Skills in producing video assignments develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Organization:** The ways in which the assignment explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.
- **Genre conventions:** Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic video essays, poetry, webpages, or personal video essays.
- **Disciplinary conventions:** Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Signers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the signer's purpose for the assignment. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, signers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to viewers.
- **Language Use:** Vocabulary, terminology, and ASL structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- **Working with Sources:** Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, signers' ideas in a text. Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that signers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes – to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.
- **Formatting:** Technical elements of production (pre, during, and post) that supports the overall quality of the assignment. Pre-production elements involve the selection of proper background, lighting, clothes, jewelry, and camera placement. Post-production elements are editing skills by incorporating titles, transitions, and credits to ensure a finished product.

American Sign Language Video Assignment Rubric

	4 (Exceptional)	3	2	1 (Developing)
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the video assignment cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the video assignment.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the video assignment.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the video assignment.
Genre / Disciplinary Conventions	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or assignments including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or assignment(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or assignment(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
Language Use	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the video assignment. Language in video is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in video is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in video is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in video is not appropriate to audience.
Working with Sources	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the assignment.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the assignment.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the assignment.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.
Formatting	Background, clothes, and jewelry are appropriate choices with no distractions. Camera placement is appropriately sized. Correct brightness of light on camera. Editing is excellent and shows a completed product.	Background, clothes, and jewelry are good choices with few distractions. Mildly close or far from camera; few signs are out of picture. Mildly dark or too bright to see signing. Editing is adequate and acceptable.	Background, clothes, and jewelry are average choices with some distraction. Little too close or too far from camera; some signs are out of the picture. Little too dark or too bright to see signing. Editing is choppy and unfinished.	Background, clothes, and jewelry are poor choices and often distracts. Too close or too far from camera; many signs go off the screen. Too dark or too bright to see signing.

Appendix E:

Deaf Culture Research Paper Rubric

Name:			Points:		
Required Elements / Point Deductions					
Turned in on time. (Each **day** late decreases by)	-10	-15	-20	-25	-30 +
Minimum of Three (3) References/ Works Cited	-0				-10
Has a Works Cited Page / Sources cited fully	-0		-5		-10
Used APA or MLA formatting (Outline NOT required)	-0		-5		-10
Topic approval signed off by instructor	-0				-10
Minimum of 1800 words. (Not including citations).	-0				-10
Majority of sources Current (within last 5 years)	-0		-5		-10
Solid sources. (No Wikipedia or About.com, etc.).	0	-10	-20	-30	-40

Total Points for Content: _____ - Deductions: _____ = Total for Research Paper: _____

Criterion	A: 100 points	B: 85 points	C: 75 Points	D: 65 Points	F: Below 60	Points
Depth and Breadth 30%	Fully researched and examined topic	Several major points were brought up	A few major points were brought up	Several points were left out of research or discussion	Obvious points were left out of research or discussion	30
Perspective 10%	Full looked at the Deaf Community as a Cultural and Linguistic Minority	Partially looked at the Deaf Community as a Cultural and Linguistic Minority	Sometimes looked at the Deaf Community as a Cultural and Linguistic Minority	Overlaying theme of the Deaf Community as disabled/Pathological Perspective of Deaf Community	Used a Pathological Perspective of the Deaf Community	10
Readability 10%	Very well prepared and easy to read.	Had some errors, but could understand intent	Had several errors, had difficulty understanding intent	Difficult to understand intent	Very difficult to understand intent of author	10
Objectivity / Third Person 5%	Did not insert personal opinion in body of paper. Body of paper was written objectively	May have alluded to personal opinion in body of paper. Body of paper was written objectively	Had some personal opinion in body of paper or Body of paper was not written objectively	Had personal opinion in body of paper. Body of paper was not written objectively	Paper was written with little or no objective research	5
Audience 5% Wrote to an audience that does not know anything about	Fully explained Acronyms and specialized terms	Most of the time explained Acronyms and specialized terms	Sometimes explained Acronyms and specialized terms	Rarely explained Acronyms and specialized terms	Did not explain Acronyms and specialized terms	5

Deafness.						
Conclusion 10% Synthesis of Research/your concluding opinions	Fully pulled together sources and connected them with your thoughts and analyzed them.	Pulled together sources and analyzed them with your opinion/what you learned on the topic	Connected somewhat with your opinion/what you learned on the topic	May have connected with your opinion/what you learned on the topic	Did not discuss your sources or connect them to your opinion/what you learned. Or did not have a conclusion.	10
Grammar 15%	Perfect/Near perfect grammar	Good grammar with some mistakes, but intent is clear	Grammar has several mistakes, but intent is clear	Grammar has several mistakes, and it is hard to understand the intent of writing	Many mistakes in grammar. Can not understand paper easily	15
Works Cited 15% Fully cite works in paper and in Works Cited page	Full names and authors in works cited page. Fully cited specific information throughout paper.	Partial names and authors in works cited page or partially cited specific information throughout paper.	Several errors in works cited page and/or in citing throughout paper	Many errors in works cited page and/or in citing throughout paper	May not have had a works cited page or may not have cited specific information consistently throughout paper	15
					Total	

Comments:

Appendix F: ASL Linguistics Rubric: Language Variance and Change

Quiz 22 Rubric: Student is able to recognize, define, or demonstrate knowledge of / or skill in using:			
	Yes	No	Score
Context			
Pragmatics			
Language Variation			
Accent			
Lexical variation			
Historical language variation			
		Total:	

Sample Questions and Answers:
Question 1: Meaning which comes from the situation in which the sentence is produced? Answer: Context
Question 2: The area of linguistics that investigates the role of context in understanding meaning is called? Answer: Pragmatics
Question 3: People in one geographic area may use a language differently from people in another geographic area? Answer: Language Variation
Question 4: "Regional, social, ethnic, gender, and age" are all categories of? Answer: Language Variation
Question 5: Regional differences can be found in the phonological system of a language. Those differences may be referred to as? Answer: Accents
Question 6: The fact that there are many different signs for PICNIC, BIRTHDAY, and SOON is considered to be an example of? Answer: Lexical Variation
Question 7: What is the likely reason that ASL seems somewhat more standardized than other sign languages such as Italian Sign Language? Answer: Many teachers came to the American School for the Deaf in Hartford Connecticut
Question 8: What reason is given as likely for why Black and White signers have been observed signing certain words differently? Answer: Segregated education (prior to 1978)
Question 9: Changes in an existing form of a sign may be introduced. The two forms may coexist for a while. Then the older form may disappear. Answer: Historical change
Question 10: The sign DIE? Answer: Has changed from one hand to two hands

2014 Assessment Statistics:
Count: 31
Minimum Value: 5.00
Maximum Value: 10.00:
Range: 5.00:
Average: 9.19
Median: 10.00
Standard Deviation: 1.15
Variance: 1.32

When and where assessed: Fall 2013 as part of the DEAF 164 course.
Assessed by: William Vicars
Audience: All majors

Appendix G: ASL Linguistics: Rubric / Language Discourse and Norms

Quiz 23 Rubric: Student is able to recognize, define, or demonstrate knowledge of / or skill in using:	Yes	No	Score
Historical Language Change:			
Metathesis			
Morphosyntactic Variation			
Language Discourse			
Language Norms			
Constructed Dialogue			
Register Variation			
Maintained bilingualism			
		Total:	

Sample Questions and Answers:
Question 1: The sign for "change channels on a television"? Answer: Has changed to look like (iconic representation of) using a remote control
Question 2: The sign for "DEAF"? Answer: Is commonly signed either "ear to chin," "chin to ear," or "contact cheek"
Question 3: The older form of the sign HOME? Answer: Was a compound consisting of EAT and SLEEP
Question 4: The sign DEAF? Answer: Is an example of metathesis.
Question 5: The dropping of a subject pronoun with verbs that usually require s subject (such as FEEL, KNOW, or LIKE) is an example of? Answer: Morphosyntactic Variation
Question 6: Use of language that goes beyond the sentence. How language is organized in conversations or in written texts. Answer: Discourse
Question 7: How many people can sign at once, how much one person should sign, what can be signed about, and so forth? Answer: Norms
Question 8: Conversations that tell someone about a conversation that has already taken place? Answer: Constructed Dialogue
Question 9: Language appropriate for a certain occasion? Answer: Register Variation
Question 10: Two languages used in the same location and both stay? Answer: maintained bilingualism

2014 Assessment Statistics:
Count: 29
Minimum Value: 5.00
Maximum Value: 10.00
Range: 5.00
Average: 9.31
Median: 10.00
Standard Deviation: 1.09
Variance: 1.18

When and where assessed: Fall 2013 as part of the DEAF 164 course.
Assessed by: William Vicars
Audience: All majors

Appendix H:

Signing Proficiency Rubric:

[Adapted from Alice Omaggio's "Teaching Language in Context" text.]

	- 0	-4	-8	-12	-16	-20	score
Fluency	Signing is natural and continuous. No unnatural pauses.	Signing is generally natural and continuous. Only slight stumbling or unnatural pauses.	Some definite stumbling but manages to rephrase or continue.	Signing is frequently hesitant and jerky, sentences may be left uncompleted.	Signing is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences.	Signing is halting and fragmentary, long unnatural pauses or phrases left unfinished	
Vocabulary	Rich and extensive vocabulary; very accurate usage	Occasionally lacks basic signs; generally accurate usage.		Often lacks needed signs and often displays inaccurate usage.		Inadequate, lacks basic signs; inaccurate usage.	
Structure	Signed phrases almost always correct.	Most signed phrases rendered correctly with some minor structural errors.	Many correctly signed phrases but with definite structural problems.	Some signed phrases rendered correctly but major structural problems remain.	Very few signed phrases structurally correct	No signed phrases structurally correct.	
Comprehensibility	Almost entirely comprehensible.	Some errors but still very comprehensible.		Many errors mostly comprehensible but may need to back track and clarify.	Mostly incomprehensible, occasional phrases can be understood.	Almost entirely incomprehensible.	
						Sub-total:	

Notes:	100 Points possible
	- ____ [Sub total from above] - ____ Negative headshake for negation - ____ Yes/no question expression - ____ "Wh" question expression - ____ Indexing / use of space referent - ____ Indexing / use of space absent referent - ____ Horizontal (or vertical) sweep for plurality: - ____ Incorporation of number - ____ Inflection for degree - ____ Directionality (subject / object) - ____ Depictive verb usage ("classifiers"): _____ SCORE

Curriculum Map:

Note: "I" stands for "Introduced", "D" for "Developed" and "M" for "Mastered"

Classes \ Outcomes	1. Demonstrate the ability to communicate in American Sign Language (ASL) with Deaf people.	2. identify major features of and issues in the Deaf Community and Deaf Culture.	3. Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of power, privilege, and oppression on the Deaf Community that result in Deaf people's experience of prejudice, discrimination, and inequity	4. Demonstrate an understanding of how the study of Deaf Studies enables individuals to make informed judgments that strengthen the Deaf Community.	5. Demonstrate an appreciation of the contributions of Deaf people to the arts and humanities.	6. Describe and explain how communication between Hearing people and Deaf people is important to society.	7. Analyze critically how a Deaf person's socio-cultural history affects one's sense of self and relationship to others.	8. Reflect critically on one's abilities to interact with Deaf individuals socially, and professionally, and evaluate the level of integration achieved.
DEAF 51 (ASL sem 1)	I	I						
DEAF 52 (ASL sem 2)	I	I						
DEAF 53 (ASL sem 3)	D	I						
DEAF 56 (ASL fingerspelling & numbers)	D							
DEAF 57 (ASL classifiers)	D							
DEAF 60 (Intro Deaf Studies)		I	I	I	I	I		
DEAF 154 (ASL sem 4)	I							
DEAF 155 (ASL sem 5)	D/M	I						
DEAF 161 (History)		D		D	D		D	
DEAF 162 (Community & Culture)		D	D	D	D	D	D	I
DEAF 163 (Literature)	D	D	D	D			D	
DEAF 164 (Linguistiics)	D	D			D, M	D	D	
DEAF 165 (Seminar)	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic	D, M-depending on topic
DEAF 166 (Service Learning as Community Allies)	D, M	M	D, M	D, M	D, M	M	D, M	D, M

Appendix J:

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC
for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Framing Language

Preparing graduates for their public lives as citizens, members of communities, and professionals in society has historically been a responsibility of higher education. Yet the outcome of a civic-minded graduate is a complex concept. Civic learning outcomes are framed by personal identity and commitments, disciplinary frameworks and traditions, pre-professional norms and practice, and the mission and values of colleges and universities. This rubric is designed to make the civic learning outcomes more explicit. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. For students this could include community-based learning through service-learning classes, community-based research, or service within the community. Multiple types of work samples or collections of work may be utilized to assess this, such as:

• The student creates and manages a service program that engages others (such as youth or members of a neighborhood) in learning about and taking action on an issue they care about. In the process, the student also teaches and models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.

• The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of public action. As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.

• The student works on and takes a leadership role in a complex campaign to bring about tangible changes in the public's awareness or education on a particular issue, or even a change in public policy. Through this process, the student demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.

• The student integrates their academic work with community engagement, producing a tangible product (piece of legislation or policy, a business, building or civic infrastructure, water quality or scientific assessment, needs survey, research paper, service program, or organization) that has engaged community constituents and responded to community needs and assets through the process.

 In addition, the nature of this work lends itself to opening up the review process to include community constituents that may be a part of the work, such as teammates, colleagues, community/agency members, and those served or collaborating in the process.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.
• Civic identity: When one sees her or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.

• Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.

• Communication skills: Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.

• Civic life: The public life of the citizen concerned with the affairs of the community and nation as contrasted with private or personal life, which is devoted to the pursuit of private and personal interests.

• Politics: A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize as individuals. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another.

• Government: "The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of conflicts." (Retrieved from the Center for Civic Engagement Web site, May 5, 2009.)

• Civic/community contexts: Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation) or defined by shared identity (i.e., African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may be defined by a variety of approaches intended to benefit a person, group, or community, including community service or volunteer work, academic work.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone: 4	Milestone: 3	Milestone: 2	Benchmark 1
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
Analysis of Knowledge	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.

Civic Identity and Commitment	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.	Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.	Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.
Civic Communication	Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action	Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.
Civic Action and Reflection	Demonstrates independent experience and *shows initiative in team leadership* of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Demonstrates independent experience and *team leadership of* civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Has clearly *participated* in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.	Has *experimented* with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.
Civic Contexts/Structures	Demonstrates ability and commitment to *collaboratively work across and within* community contexts and structures *to achieve a civic aim*.	Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively *within* community contexts and structures *to achieve a civic aim*.	Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to *participate in* civic contexts and structures.	Experiments with civic contexts and structures, *tries out a few to see what fits*.