



If you have any questions or concerns about the form, please contact Brittany Brown at bbrown3@framingham.edu or 508-626-4742.

Program Assessment

First Name: *

Last Name: *

Banner ID: *

Email: *

Please select the reporting period this assessment/accreditation work was completed:

*

Please select the type of program you completed assessment/accreditation work for this reporting period:

Note: If changing your initial selection, please refresh this page prior to making a new selection.

*

Please select the program you completed assessment for during this reporting period:

*

Please select the option that best describes the assessment work completed during this reporting period.

- * Only assessed program learning objective(s)
- Only completed other assessment activities (ex. assessment plan, rubrics etc.)
- Assessed program learning objective(s) and completed other assessment activities (ex. assessment plan, rubrics etc.)
- Did not undertake program assessment work

Program Learning Objectives Assessed

List the first program learning objective assessed during this reporting period:

For the first program learning objective assessed, other than GPA, what data/evidence was used to assess student learning? (e.g. capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)

1. Senior year practicum supervisor evaluation completed at the end of the spring semester, right before graduation. Specifically, this objective is assessed by supervisor responses to questions #16 and #18 (interpreting from English to ASL), #17 and #19 (interpreting from ASL to English), #20 (consumer confidence in student's interpreting skill) and #22 which asks "What timeframe do you recommend for this student to take the Massachusetts Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (MCDHH) Interpreter Screening?"

2. Results of MCDHH Interpreter Screening examination.

For the first program learning objective assessed what were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s)?

1. Out of eight (8) evaluations for six (6) students [some students have more than one practicum supervisor] two (2) evaluations gave the student the highest rating on a 5-point Likert scale on questions 16-20. Three(3) evaluations gave students a rating of 4 out of 5 on the Likert scale on all questions in this set. Three evaluations gave the student anywhere from 1 to 4 on these questions. Of note was that one student received a score of 1 on all aspects of her interpreting skills.

Two (2) evaluations stated the student was prepared to take the MCDHH Interpreter Screening immediately; one evaluation stated the student would be prepared in three to six months; four (4) evaluations stated the student would be prepared in one

to two years' time; one (1) evaluation stated the student would be prepared within three years.

2. As of this reporting, one student attempted and passed the MCDHH Interpreter Screening examination within five months of graduation.

Attach any additional documents (data or survey summaries, charts, graphs etc.) that support your results/findings/conclusions (optional):

Practicum II Spring 2021 Evaluations of Students, Redacted.pdf

For the first program learning objective assessed what changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?

No changes made at this time. The practicum experience of this group of students was significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic. The results of this year's evaluations may not be reflected again in future cohorts if there's a return to in-person practicums.

Did you assess any additional program learning objectives during this reporting period?

- Yes
 No

List the second program learning objective assessed during this reporting period:

PLO 3 - Graduating students should be able to integrate their knowledge of the history, culture, values and diversity of the Deaf/

For the second program learning objective assessed, other than GPA, what data/evidence was used to assess student learning? (e.g. capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)

Questions 7-9 on the practicum evaluation form were looked at to assess PLO 3. Question #7 asks about cultural competence, #8 about linguistic competence, and #9 about ethical conduct. Of the eight evaluations received, all students received a rating of 4 to 5 for cultural competence and ethical conduct. Ratings of linguistic competence (#8) were more varied, ranging from 3 to 4 for the majority of students and only two evaluations giving the student a rating of 5.

For the second program learning objective assessed what were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s)?

Students do well developing cultural competence and ethical conduct. The ratings on linguistic competence indicate that students are weaker in this area, which is supported by student performance in the interpreting and ASL classes.

Attach any additional documents (data or survey summaries, charts, graphs etc.) that support your results/findings/conclusions (optional):

For the second program learning objective assessed what changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?

The program faculty met at the start of the fall 21 semester to begin to look at changes that can be made to the ASL curriculum.

Who interprets the results/findings of the assessment? Describe the process (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee).

ASL FT program faculty: Bruce Bucci, Luce Aubry, Nozomi Tomita and practicum instructor Irma Kahle.

Program Information

Enter the year of the most recent program review. If the program is new, enter the upcoming program review year or enter TBD (to be determined).

2020

Insert the URL of the web page where Program Learning Objectives for this program are published:

NECHE requires this as part of being transparent to stakeholders.

<https://www.framingham.edu/academics/colleges/arts-and-humanities/world-languages/academics/majors/american-sign-language>

Signatures

Luce Aubry

11/13/2021

Submitter Signature

Date

Office of Institutional Assessment

Institutional Assessment Signature

Date