PET FORM
Planning and Evaluation Tracking
(2012-2013 Assessment Period)

Division of: Arts and Sciences

Person Responsible for this Division: Jerry Moller

Department of: English and Modern Languages (American Sign Language/Interpreter)

Primary Person Responsible for this Form: Dr. Cynthia Sturkie

Purpose Statement (With Last Updated Date): Educate students in American Sign Language.

Goal Statement #1:

- Certify quality instruction and academic support services (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.3).
- Expand student success (Achieving the Dream/No Excuses Goal 1).

Outcome/Objective Statement #1A
(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):
Upon completion of SGNL 2302, at least 90% of all students will score 70% or above on all syllabi objectives as determined by embedded assessment methods delivered through formal assignments and the clock hours students spend interacting with the deaf community.

Exact wording of Strategic Plan: After receiving and discussing assessment analysis of common course sections, all faculty will revise course sections for consistency in student learning outcomes regardless of delivery method or faculty status across the curriculum.

- <u>Results (If Applicable, Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)</u>
  2012 Results:
  - 10 out of 11 students scored between 70-100% on receptive skills directly measured in five formal assessments.
  - 11 out of 11 students scored about 70% on expressive skills directly measured using five formal assessments.
  - 10 out of 11 students spent 10 hours or more interacting in the deaf community as measured by a student log.

2012 Results:
Receptive Skills: 90% of students scored above target
Expressive Skills: 100% of students scored above target
Deaf Community Participation: 90% scored above target

- <u>Analysis</u>
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis
    (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
    There is no previous assessment that exactly matches the tests given in 2012 so there is no comparison data. The benchmark was met.

- Improvements
    - List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year:
      Last year I redesigned all tests to directly align with course objectives. Since fall 2012, I have required periodic reviews of student participation logs.

    - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
      The students were successful on benchmarks, but there was still a pattern of strengths and weaknesses observed. Expressive skills were stronger than receptive skills so next year more time will be allotted to addressing receptive skills.

    - What Budget Implications Were Involved with this Improvement? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details):
      The adjustments are not monetary; they are directed at redirecting class time to address skills which take more time to develop.

- Recommendations/Actions for **2012-2013**
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):
      Dr. Cynthia Sturkie
    - Action Plan:
        - Results will be distributed to the department chair. The course schedule will reflect more time spent on receptive skills next year by a greater variety of signers. (It was noted the receptive recording of the teacher resulted in higher scores than of a person the students were unfamiliar with.)
        - The same assessments will be given in 2012-2013 in order to measure improvement in targeted skills.
        - The students will be required to practice receptive skills with a wider variety of signers.
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):
      New video of a wider variety of signers will be developed in the summer of 2012.
      The new revised schedule will be implemented in the Spring of 2012.
      Student performance will be monitored throughout the semester on individual exams.
      Tutoring will be offered to those who do not master course objectives.
    - What Budget Implications Are Involved with this Action? (Please Provide Cost Estimate/Details):
      No budgeted money is needed for communication, process review, and implementation.