

**ASL-Eng. Interpreting**

**Annual Assessment 16-17**

**Created by Assessment Insight System**

# Annual Assessment

## ASL - English Interpreting

### Program Profile

#### Program Mission Statement

*Please insert your program mission statement here*

*The American Sign Language and Interpreting Program at WWU prepares graduates to work as culturally responsible professionals providing excellent service to the Deaf Community.*

#### Program Data

##### Delivery Method

Traditional On Campus (selected)

Online

Hybrid

##### Students Majors 2015-2016

50

##### Student Majors 2016-2017

47

##### Concentrations 2015-2016

*If your program contains concentrations, please list the concentrations and the number of students identified within each concentration.*

There are no concentrations in the Interpreting Major.

##### Concentrations 2016-2017

*If your program contains concentrations, please list the concentrations and the number of students identified with each concentration.*

There are no concentrations in the Interpreting Major.

#### Student Demographics

*Program goals for student retention, persistence and degree completion are? What do the persistence numbers mean to the faculty in the program? Are your persistence numbers what you expected? If not, how could the numbers be improved? What is the optimal enrollment for the program?*

The ASL-English Interpreting program is one that students come into the university claiming as their intended major before they even take any classes within the degree. Students don't actually take interpreting courses until they test into the program in the spring of their sophomore year while they are enrolled in ASL 4. This impacts retention in the program as students declare the major in the registrars office but they are not officially in until a year later. Another issue with retention is that students declare the major without taking any interpreting courses and many students are misled with what the job of interpreter entails. It is common for many students to take Theory of Interpreting the fall of their sophomore year and realize that interpreting is not what they thought it was.

The program is concerned with retention and persistence but also aware of the need for students to pass a National or State certification at the completion of the program. The program considers keeping a student in an ASL related field as a successful completer of the program. The official goal of the program is to keep retention of the program a minimum of 1% higher than the university overall retention rate.

### Is the Program Externally Accredited

Yes

No (selected)

### External Accreditation

*Name the Accrediting Agency or entity including the last review/approval. Is there an accrediting body for the field of study? If yes, what is the name of the group? Is the program seeking accreditation? If no, why?*

Accreditation is offered by the Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE). The program faculty along with the Academic Dean and the Dean of the College of Graduate and Outreach made a deliberate decision to prioritize the implementation of the online degree completion program in Interpreting, thus postponing accreditation applications and processes as data showing a few years of successful management of the program is required by CCIE in order to earn accreditation.

In 2015, the university decided to eliminate the Program Director position. As a result, we do not qualify for accreditation and our timeline to apply is currently on hold. There is some question as to the need for the program to apply for accreditation as there are changes happening in the accrediting body. They CCIE recently decided to eliminate their accreditation of 2-year programs, terminating their accreditation. These program spent thousands on their accrediting process and then it was deemed unnecessary. The program has determined that it is necessary to let the accrediting body settle in and determine their process moving forward while the program continues to refine coursework and collect data before moving forward with accreditation.

## Program Assessment

### Standard/Outcome

| Identifier       | Description   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>WWU2016.1</b> | Major Field Competence: Students will demonstrate excellence in an academic or professional discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.  |
| <b>WWU2016.2</b> | Ethics: Students will exhibit values and behaviors that address self- respect and respect for others that will enable success and participation in the larger society.                              |
| <b>WWU2016.3</b> | Self-Liberation: Students will develop an honest understanding and appreciation of themselves and others resulting in an ability to make individual decisions.                                      |
| <b>WWU2016.4</b> | Lifelong Education: Students will possess an intellectual curiosity and desire for continual learning both within and beyond formal education in preparation for participation in a global society. |

**Additional Standards/Outcomes**

| Identifier | Description  |
|------------|--|
| ITP.1      | Theory and Knowledge Competencies that will embody the academic foundation and world knowledge that is essential to effective interpretation.    |
| ITP.2      | Human Relations Competencies of interpersonal communicative skills that foster effective collaboration with colleagues, consumers and employers. |
| ITP.3      | Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language and English.  |
| ITP.4      | Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings.             |
| ITP.5      | Professionalism Competencies demonstrating application of professional standards and practices.  |

**General Education Alignment to Program**

*How do the General Education criteria align with the Program Objectives? What courses within your program build upon skills learned in general education courses (please list the program course and the general education criteria). The General Education clusters are: Critical Analysis, Creative Expression, Quantitative Inquiry, and Society & the Individual. See attached for more detailed breakdown.*

Because sign language interpreters work in every imaginable setting, general education is critical to their success. Information learned in these classes is reinforced through the wide variety of texts that students interpret throughout their program of education here.

Critical Analysis: (Critical Thinking, Ethics, Meaning)

ASL220 Ethics and Decision Making (GE), ITP 310 Interpreting in Advanced Settings I, ITP410 Interpreting in Advanced Settings II, and ITP451/452 Field Practicum courses use the skills in an applied manner that are laid down in the general education courses. These classes do extensive ethical decision making projects and case studies for students to practice as Interpreting is a profession that requires quick thinking in some pretty sticky situations.

Society and the Individual: (Social Science, Diversity, Historical Perspective)

ITP301 Interpreting I, ITP351 Interpreting II, ITP375 Interpreting III, and ITP380 Interpreting IV are Interpreting skills classes that use a variety of source text material that covers these areas: application for SSI, TED talks on social issues, this day in History podcasts and additional books for reading, on History, Culture Facts, and Sociological topics.

\*additional required elective for social science dealing with social issues, history and diversity of individuals.

Creative Expression: (Communication, Fine Arts)

IITP301 Interpreting I, ITP351 Interpreting II, ITP375 Interpreting III, and ITP380 Interpreting IV are Interpreting skills classes that use a variety of source text material that covers these areas: TED talks on Art in schools, how to write a short story, interpersonal communication, gendered communication.

The entire major is about how to communicate effectively so there are additional English classes as an option for students to take to strengthen their communication skills.

Quantitative Inquiry: (Natural Science, Mathematics)

ITP301 Interpreting I, ITP351 Interpreting II, ITP375 Interpreting III, and ITP380 Interpreting IV are Interpreting skills classes that use a variety of source text material that covers these areas: TED talks on

biology, technology, Math Parallel lessons, and Technical signing source material on body functions as well as mathematical formulas.

GE\_Cluster\_Descriptions\_FINAL\_Version\_Approved.docx

## Curriculum Map

A - Assessed  
I - Introduced  
R - Reinforced  
M - Master

### Interpreting Curriculum Map

|   | ASL 101 | ASL 120 | ASL 220 | ASL 345 | ASL 425 | ASL 430 | ITP 211 | ITP 217 | ITP 301 | ITP 310 | ITP 351 | ITP 375 | ITP 380 | ITP 410 | ITP 450 | ITP 451 | ITP 452 | Performance Rev. |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|
| <b>ITP.1</b> Theory and Knowledge Competencies that will embody the academic foundation and world knowledge that is essential to effective interpretation.    | I       |         | I, A    |         |         | R       | I, A    | I       | R       | R       | R       | R       | M       | R       | M, A    | M       | M, A    |                  |
| <b>ITP.2</b> Human Relations Competencies of interpersonal communicative skills that foster effective collaboration with colleagues, consumers and employers. | I       | I       | I, R    | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | R       | M       | M       | M, A    |                  |
| <b>ITP.3</b> Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language and English.  | I       | R       | R       | M       |         | R       | R       | R       | R, A    | R       | R       | R       | R, A    | R       | R, A    | M       | M, A    | A                |
| <b>ITP.4</b> Interpreting   |         |         | M       | A       |         |         | I       | I       | R, A    | R       | R       | R       | R, A    |         | R       | M       | M, A    | A                |

|   |   |   |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |   |  |   |   |   |      |   |      |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|------|---|------|--|
| Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings. |   |   |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |   |  |   |   |   |      |   |      |  |
| <b>ITP.5</b><br>Professionalism Competencies demonstrating application of professional standards and practices.         | I | I |  |  |  |  | R |  |  | R |  | R | R | R | R, A | M | M, A |  |

## Assessment Findings

### Assessment Findings for the Assessment Measure level for Interpreting Curriculum Map

ITP.1 Theory and Knowledge Competencies that will embody the academic foundation and world knowledge that is essential to effective interpretation.

#### Assessment Measures

| ITP 211             |  |   |                                   |   |
|---------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Assessment Measure  | Criterion  | Summary   | Attachments of the Assessments    | Improvement Narratives  |
| Direct - Final Exam | Has the criterion 80% of students in Theory of Interpreting will score a minimum of 80% on the final exam questions pertaining to interpreting theory, linguistics, and communication been met yet?<br>Not met | The data was not collected due to a teaching shift and lack of communication as to the needed assessment for the course. If one were to look at the over score on the final exam, only 4/12 or 33% of the students scored at 80% or greater score on the final exam. The specific question scores are not available, only the | ITP211_data_for_Annual_report.pdf | - Curriculum Revision: the course online needs to be revisited. This was the first time a new faculty has taught that course in about 7 years and the content is a bit off from where it was expected to be. The program needs to review the objectives of the course and modify the course activities accordingly. |

|                           |  |  |   |   |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                           |  | composite scores.  |   |   |
| <b>ASL 220</b>            |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Assessment Measure</b> | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b>   | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>   |
| Direct - Case Study       | Has the criterion 85% of the students will earn a grade of B (84) or higher for the Ethics Case Study been met yet?<br>Not met | This course was not taught by a program faculty this term and so the assignment in the on campus version of the course did not happen. The material was not communicated effectively to the adjunct faculty. There is data available for the Online version of the course only. The online course had 19 students participating in the assessment of the case study. | Via___General_Education___Ethical_Reasoning_Rubric_Report_07_09_2017_163747.pdf | - Revise Program Benchmark: The program benchmark is set up to evaluate to a student score, the benchmark needs to speak to skill set on the rubric, then no matter the teacher, the assessment information is present. |
| <b>ITP 450</b>            |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Assessment Measure</b> | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b>   | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>   |
| Direct - Research Paper   | Has the criterion 85% of the class will be evaluated at an expert level on the research paper been met yet?<br>Met             | 100% of the course met the benchmark. The assignment was tiered throughout the semester and the lowest score on the paper was a 96%.   | ITP450_Research_paper.png   |   |
| Direct - Portfolio Review | Has the criterion Portfolio grade of A or higher for 85% of the students in the class been met yet?<br>Met                     | 90% of students achieved the benchmark of 80% or higher on the Portfolio. One student did not pass the portfolio.  | Screen_Shot_2017_04_26_at_4.02.27_PM.jpg  |   |

**ITP.2 Human Relations Competencies of interpersonal communicative skills that foster effective collaboration with colleagues, consumers and employers.**

**Assessment Measures**

**ITP 452**

| <b>Assessment Measure</b>      | <b>Criterion</b>  | <b>Summary</b>  | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Indirect - External Evaluation | Has the criterion Average of 3 on a 5-point Likert scale from the Mentor Interpreter evaluation on questions relating to Human Relations been met yet?<br>Met | There were 31 online and 10 on ground students who completed the Field Practicum course during the academic year 16-17. Of those students the average score for the online students in Domain 1 was 4.72 and on ground students average score was 4.42. | Domain_2_ITP.xlsx                     |                               |

**ITP.3 Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language and English.**

**Assessment Measures**

**ITP 380**

| <b>Assessment Measure</b> | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>  | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b>   | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Direct - Video            | Has the criterion 78% of students will obtain a minimum score of 84% or higher on a cold interpretation been met yet?<br>Not met | The course did not meet the objective as only 3/7 students scored higher than an 84% on the Cold Interpretation. Only 42.8% of the class met the benchmark. | Via___Interpreting_IV___01___FUL___3___Spring_1617_Activity_Assessments_Aggregated_Result_07_13_2017_133748.pdf | - Revise Program Benchmark: the benchmark needs to be revised to meet grading standards that were modified by the program. with the 2018 grading standards, 5/7 students would have met the benchmark with a success rate of 71.4% |

**ITP 301**

| <b>Assessment Measure</b> | <b>Criterion</b> | <b>Summary</b> | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|



|                |  |  |                                    |  |
|----------------|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Direct - Video | Has the criterion 60% of students will obtain a minimum score of 74% or higher on a cold interpretation been met yet?<br>Not met | The class did not meet the benchmark. The class did a cold interpretation on the video "My First Day in Italy" and only 3 of the 9 students were successful at the 74% or higher benchmark. Two additional students achieved 73 and 72 on the video but were still short of the objective. | ITP301_data_for_Annual_report.xlsx | - Curriculum Revision: The program needs to go back and look at the basic foundational activities that are covered in the curriculum as there appear to be some gaps in the knowledge and cognitive flexibility of use of ASL with the students. |
|----------------|--|--|------------------------------------|--|

#### ITP 452

| Assessment Measure             | Criterion   | Summary   | Attachments       | Improvement Narratives |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| Indirect - External Evaluation | Has the criterion Average of 3 on a 5-point Likert scale from the Mentor Interpreter evaluation on questions relating to Language Skills been met yet?<br>Met | There were 31 online and 10 on ground students who completed the Field Practicum course during the academic year 16-17. Of those students the average score for the online students in Domain 1 was 4.25 and on ground students average score was 3.59. One thought as to the difference between the two groups is the experience of the online program students. Over half of the online students are working interpreters with practical experience in the field. | Domain_3_ITP.xlsx |                        |

#### Student Performance Review

| Assessment Measure | Criterion  | Summary   | Attachments of the Assessments | Improvement Narratives |
|--------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Direct - Quiz/Exam | Has the criterion 85% of students will achieve a minimum of 70% on the ASL evaluation been met yet?<br>Not met | This evaluation was not completed this academic year. Students do this assessment with the ASL skills assessment and no needed to be repeated here. |                                |                        |

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

**ITP.4 Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings.**

**Assessment Measures**

| <b>ITP 301</b>            |  |  |                                       |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Assessment Measure</b> | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
| Direct - Video            | Has the criterion 60% of students will obtain a minimum score of 74% or higher on a cold interpretation been met yet?<br>Not met | The class did not meet the benchmark. The class did a cold interpretation on the video "My First Day in Italy" and only 3 of the 9 students were successful at the 74% or higher benchmark. Two additional students achieved 73 and 72 on the video but were still short of the objective. |                                       | - Curriculum Revision: The program needs to go back and look at the basic foundational activities that are covered in the curriculum as there appear to be some gaps in the knowledge and cognitive flexibility of use of ASL with the students. |

| <b>ITP 452</b>                 |   |  |                                       |                               |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Assessment Measure</b>      | <b>Criterion</b>  | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b> |
| Indirect - External Evaluation | Has the criterion Average of 3 on a 5-point Likert scale from the Mentor interpreter evaluation on questions relating to Interpreting Skills been met yet?<br>Met | There were 31 online and 10 on ground students who completed the Field Practicum course during the academic year 16-17. Of those students the average score for the online students in Domain 1 was 4.76 and on ground students average score was 3.56. One thought as to the difference between | Domain_4_ITP.xls<br>x                 |                               |

|                                   |  | the two groups is the experience of the online program students. Over half of the online students are working interpreters with practical experience in the field. |                                       |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Student Performance Review</b> |  |  |                                       |   |
| <b>Assessment Measure</b>         | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>   |
| Direct - Quiz/Exam                | Has the criterion 85% of seniors will achieve a minimum of 75% on the Interpreting evaluation been met yet?<br>Not met | Only 71.4% of the students met the benchmark of 75 or higher on the assessment. (5 out of 7)   | Interp_assessment_2017.pdf            | - Revise Program Benchmark: Revise the wording in the benchmark as the majority of the course met the benchmark, but due to low numbers the goal is not attainable. |
| Direct - Quiz/Exam                | Has the criterion 85% of juniors will achieve a minimum of 60% on the Interpreting evaluation been met yet?<br>Not met | Only 57.1% of the Juniors met the benchmark of a 60% or higher on the assessment. (4 out of 7)   |                                       | - Revise Program Benchmark: Revise the wording in the benchmark as the majority of the course met the benchmark, but due to low numbers the goal is not attainable. |

|   |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| ITP.5 Professionalism Competencies demonstrating application of professional standards and practices. |  |   |   |  |
| Assessment Measures   |  |   |   |  |
| <b>ITP 450</b>  |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>  | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b>   | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
| Direct - Quiz/Exam  | Has the criterion 85% of students will achieve 74% or higher on the Final Written Interpreting Knowledge exam been met yet?<br>Not met | Only 50% of the students met the benchmark of a 74% or higher on the Written Interpreting Knowledge exam.   | ITP450_TEP_2017.png   | - Curriculum Revision: The program needs to look at ways to incorporate more English skills in the assignments that are collected. We also need to look at additional English requirements for students.                           |
| <b>ITP 380</b>  |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>  | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b>   | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
| Direct - Video  | Has the criterion 75% of students will obtain a minimum score of 84% or higher on a cold interpretation been met yet?<br>Not met       | The course did not meet the objective as only 3/7 students scored higher than an 84% on the Cold Interpretation. Only 42.8% of the class met the benchmark. | Via___Interpreting_IV___01___FUL___3___Spring_1617_Activity_Assessments_Aggregated_Result_07_13_2017_133748.pdf | - Revise Program Benchmark: the benchmark needs to be revised to meet grading standards that were modified by the program. with the 2018 grading standards, 5/7 students would have met the benchmark with a success rate of 71.4% |

### Analysis of the Assessment Process

*Describe your assessment process; clearly articulate how the program is using course work and or assessment day activities for program assessment. Note any changes that occurred to that process since the previous year. Discuss what activities were successful at assessment and which ones were not as helpful and why. Please include who met to discuss the changes (unless you are a program of one person) and when you met. – Include*

*a discussion on the process for collection and analysis of program data.*

The assessment for the academic year 16-17 was disjointed and hectic due to the loss of a full time faculty member and the need to use adjunct faculty for the full year. The faculty left the institution right before the year began in the fall and created last minute course changes and a loop in the assessment process. It was challenging to get all the objectives covered in a successful manner. Many of the objectives were not met and some of that is due to class size, as well as different instructors teaching classes they did not have much time to prepare for. More discussion needs to be put into the assessment cycle to ensure that classes are covering needed material and that faculty are aware of the assessment assignments they need to create and use in their courses.

### Improvement Narrative List

#### Assessment Findings for the Assessment Measure level

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.1 Theory and Knowledge Competencies that will embody the academic foundation and world knowledge that is essential to effective interpretation. |   |
| Legend                | A   |   |
| Course/Event          | ASL 220   |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Case Study   |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met   |   |
| Improvement Narrative |   |   |
|                       | <b>Improvement Type</b>   | <b>Summary</b>  |
|                       | Revise Program Benchmark  | The program benchmark is set up to evaluate to a student score, the benchmark needs to speak to skill set on the rubric, then no matter the teacher, the assessment information is present. |

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.1 Theory and Knowledge Competencies that will embody the academic foundation and world knowledge that is essential to effective interpretation. |  |
| Legend                | A   |  |
| Course/Event          | ITP 211   |  |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Final Exam   |  |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met   |  |
| Improvement Narrative |   |  |
|                       | <b>Improvement Type</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   |
|                       | Curriculum  | The course online needs to be revisited. This was the first time a new |

|  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
|  | Revision | faculty has taught that course in about 7 years and the content is a bit off from where it was expected to be. The program needs to review the objectives of the course and modify the course activities accordingly. |
|--|----------|---|

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.3 Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language and English. |   |
| Legend                | A   |   |
| Course/Event          | ITP 301   |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Video  |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met   |   |
| Improvement Narrative |   |   |
|                       | Improvement Type  | Summary   |
|                       | Curriculum Revision   | The program needs to go back and look at the basic foundational activities that are covered in the curriculum as there appear to be some gaps in the knowledge and cognitive flexibility of use of ASL with the students. |

|                       |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.4 Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings. |   |
| Legend                | A  |   |
| Course/Event          | ITP 301  |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Video   |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met  |   |
| Improvement Narrative |  |   |
|                       | Improvement Type   | Summary   |
|                       | Curriculum Revision  | The program needs to go back and look at the basic foundational activities that are covered in the curriculum as there appear to be some gaps in the knowledge and cognitive flexibility of use of ASL with the students. |

|                  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|
| Standard/Outcome | ITP.3 Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language |  |
|------------------|--|--|

|                       |                          |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
|                       | and English.             |  |
| Legend                | A                        |  |
| Course/Event          | ITP 380                  |  |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Video           |  |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met                  |  |
| Improvement Narrative |                          |  |
|                       | Improvement Type         | Summary  |
|                       | Revise Program Benchmark | The benchmark needs to be revised to meet grading standards that were modified by the program. with the 2018 grading standards, 5/7 students would have met the benchmark with a success rate of 71.4% |

|                       |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.4 Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings. |  |
| Legend                | A  |  |
| Course/Event          | ITP 380  |  |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Video   |  |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met  |  |
| Improvement Narrative |  |  |
|                       | Improvement Type   | Summary  |
|                       | Revise Program Benchmark   | The benchmark needs to be revised to meet grading standards that were modified by the program. with the 2018 grading standards, 5/7 students would have met the benchmark with a success rate of 71.4% |

|                     |   |  |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Standard/Outcome    | ITP.3 Language Skills Competencies for the effective use of American Sign Language and English. |  |
| Legend              | A   |  |
| Course/Event        | ITP 450   |  |
| Assessment Measure  | Direct - Quiz/Exam  |  |
| Assessment Findings | Not met   |  |
| Improvement         |   |  |

|           |                         |   |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|
| Narrative |                         |   |
|           | <b>Improvement Type</b> | <b>Summary</b>  |
|           | Curriculum Revision     | The program needs to review the English structure within the program to ensure that it allows for enough support to assist students in passing this English proficiency exam for certification. |

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.5 Professionalism Competencies demonstrating application of professional standards and practices. |   |
| Legend                | A   |   |
| Course/Event          | ITP 450   |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Quiz/Exam  |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met   |   |
| Improvement Narrative |   |   |
|                       | <b>Improvement Type</b>   | <b>Summary</b>  |
|                       | Curriculum Revision   | The program needs to look at ways to incorporate more English skills in the assignments that are collected. We also need to look at additional English requirements for students. |

|                       |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.4 Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings. |   |
| Legend                | A  |   |
| Course/Event          | Student Performance Review   |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Quiz/Exam   |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met  |   |
| Improvement Narrative |  |   |
|                       | <b>Improvement Type</b>  | <b>Summary</b>  |
|                       | Revise Program Benchmark   | Revise the wording in the benchmark as the majority of the course met the benchmark, but due to low numbers the goal is not attainable. |



|                       |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Standard/Outcome      | ITP.4 Interpreting Skills Competencies for the effective ASL-English interpretation of a range of subject matter in a variety of settings. |   |
| Legend                | A  |   |
| Course/Event          | Student Performance Review   |   |
| Assessment Measure    | Direct - Quiz/Exam   |   |
| Assessment Findings   | Not met  |   |
| Improvement Narrative |  |   |
|                       | Improvement Type   | Summary   |
|                       | Revise Program Benchmark   | Revise the wording in the benchmark as the majority of the course met the benchmark, but due to low numbers the goal is not attainable. |

## Program Activities

### Student Performance Review

*Describe the department assessment day activities if not already described previously. Please articulate the nature of the assessments are conducted, explain the process for assessment that happens on these two days. Include the schedule of assessment day for your program. What does the data and outcomes tell you? What changes will you make as a result of the data? What areas are successful for the program?*

Students in the Interpreting program participated in a English language assessment evaluation. This is a test that the studentns have taken for the past few years as a measure of their English skills. This is important as the new state certification evaluation requires that students pass an English exam before they can even take the performance evaluation. The breakdown was as follows for the 2016-2017 academic year.

Sophomore: 13 out of 15 students scored at or above 50% on the evaluation, Junior: 4 out of 7 scored at or above 60% on the evaluation, seniors: 5 out of 8 scored above 70% on the evaluation.

Students also take an Interpreting evaluation that is assessed by two part time faculty in the online program. The current benchmarks are set for a score, but in reality it is the score of Proficient or greater that is the best language. Senior students: 5 out of 7 scored at or above 80% and Junior students: 3 out of 7 scored at or above 70% on the evaluation.

Students looking to enter the Interpreting program in the fall are required to take the Program Entrance Evaluation. This is an evaluation where students watch a video and then have to reproduce the story. This is recorded and reviewed by program faculty. For the Signing Proficiency, of the 15 students, only 2 were evaluated to be at risk to entering the program.

Last students take a survey on thier satisfaction with all things related to the program. This survey talks about ASL, ITP and Lab components as they are all interrelated. The survey data (N: 43) is attached, but all aspects but one received higher than a 4 out of 5 average from students. The one area that did not get a 4.0 dealt with the University about the program. This is not something that the program has much control over. A few areas

on the survey that scored low 4's were related to advising, course activities being explained clearly, and lab activities being beneficial. The program will look at these issues and see where we can improve.

### **Student Performance Review Schedule**

*Upload the program schedule for students during Performance Reviews.*

SPR2017.xlsx

English\_Scores.pdf

### **Senior Showcase**

*Describe program Senior Showcase activities if not detailed previously in the report? What benefit does the program gain from the activities? What if any assessment of students happens during this event? What changes if any will occur due to what is learned by faculty on Senior Showcase?*

Senior Showcase this year only had 3 students participate. The majority of Interpreting students graduate in the spring, but they do their internship in the summer, so they don't have anything to present for the presentations. Only a few students actually do the presentations and this year there was one student in the fall and two in the spring. We do them science fair style, and students produce a PowerPoint that they present to faculty and students as they circulate around the room.

### **Assessment Rubrics**

*Upload rubrics used for Senior Showcase or Student Performance Reviews for student assessment.*

### **Service Learning**

*Does the Program include projects/ course content that uses the philosophy of service learning?*

Yes

No (selected)

### **Service Learning Component**

*If so, how is service learning infused in the coursework within your department? Is service or community engagement in the program mission? Describe the Service Learning Activities that your students and department engaged in this past year. How did the activities improve student learning? How did the activities benefit the community?*

### **LEAD Events**

*Highlight lead events sponsored by program faculty that are connected to program or general education objectives for the past academic year. Include a total number of lead events program faculty sponsored.*

The program this year was reeling to work to cover the vacancy in a faculty position. There were not any LEAD events offered by Interpreting Faculty this year.

### **Student Accomplishments**

*Highlight special examples of student successes in the field (academic: mentor-mentee, conference presentations, competitive internship, journal acceptance; extra-curricular: horse show championship, art exhibit). This is for any accomplishments that a student achieved outside of course work or the normal expectations of student success.*

This year student Emily Bowman achieved Interpreting Certification prior to completing her course work. We also had several students pass the written portion of thier BEI Certification.

|   | 3.000 Assessment Reflects Best Practices  | 2.000 Assessment Meets the Expectations of the University   | 1.000 Assessment Needs Development   | 0.000 Assessment is Inadequate  | N/A   |
|---|---|---|--|---|-------|
| Learning Objectives<br>weight: 1.000                        | ✔ • Detailed, measurable program learning objectives • Objectives are shared with students and faculty  | ✔ • Measurable program learning objectives. • Learning objectives are available to students.  | ✔ • Program learning objectives are identified and are generally measurable  | ✔ • Program learning objectives are not clear or measurable   | ✔ N/A |
| Comment:  |   |   |  |   |       |
| Assessment Measures<br>weight: 1.000                        | ✔ • Multiple measures are used to assess a student-learning objectives. • Rubrics or guides are used for the measures. • All measurements are clearly described. • External evaluation of student learning included.                                | ✔ • Assessment measures relate to program learning objectives. • Various measures are used to assess student learning. • Measures chosen provide useful information about student learning.   | ✔ • Assessment focuses on class content only. • Minimal description of how the assessment relates to the objective. • Minimal assessment measures established.   | ✔ • Assessment measures not connected to objectives. • Assessment measures are not clear. • No assessment measures are established.   | ✔ N/A |
| Comment:  | The assessments are explained and evidence is provided to back up the claims.   |   |  |   |       |
| Assessment Results<br>weight: 1.000                         | ✔ • All objectives are assessed annually, or a rotation schedule is provided. • Data are collected and analyzed to show learning over time. • Standards for performance and gaps in student learning are clearly identified.                        | ✔ • Most objectives assessed annually. • Data collected and analyzed showing an annual snapshot of student learning. • Data are used to highlight gaps in student learning. • Some data from non-course based content.                                      | ✔ • Data collected for at least one program objective. • Data collection is incomplete. • Gaps in student learning not identified. • Lacking external data to support course data.   | ✔ • Learning objectives are not routinely assessed. • Routine data is not collected. • No discussion on gaps in student learning. • No use of external data to support student learning. • Assessment data not yet collected. | ✔ N/A |
| Comment:  |   |   |  |   |       |
| Faculty Analysis and Conclusions<br>weight: 1.000           | ✔ • Data is shared that incorporates multiple faculty from the program. • Discussions on data results incorporate multiple faculty. • Opportunities for adjunct faculty to participate. • Includes input from external sources when possible.       | ✔ • Multiple program faculty receive assessment results. • Assessment results are discussed • Specific conclusions about student learning are made based on the available assessment results.   | ✔ • Minimal faculty input about results is sought • Data not used to determine success or not to the objective. • Minimal conclusions made.  | ✔ • Faculty input is not sought. • Conclusions about student learning are not identified. • N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes.   | ✔ N/A |
| Comment:  | Was there an improvement narrative for the missed benchmark for the 306 class?  |   |  |   |       |
| Actions to Improve Learning and Assessment<br>weight: 1.000 | ✔ • All assessment methods, timetable for assessing, and evaluating the effectiveness modifications are included. • Changes to assessment are inclusive of multiple faculty. • Description of changes is detailed and linked to assessment results. | ✔ • More than one change to assessment is proposed, timetable for assessment, and evaluating the change is provided. • Changes to assessment measures is highlighted. • Changes are realistic, with a good probability of improving learning or assessment. | ✔ • At least one change to improve learning or assessment is identified. • The proposed action(s) relates to faculty conclusions about areas for improvement. • Adjustments to the assessment are proposed but not clearly connected to data | ✔ • Lacking actions to improve student learning. • Actions discussed lack supportive data. • Lacking discussion of the effectiveness of the assessment plan   | ✔ N/A |
| Comment:  | The program does a good job of keeping track of changes and reviewing the curriculum. Program changes and assessment modifications have helped to provide a stronger picture of student success.  |   |  |   |       |